

research building and a biology research building; the University of Rhode Island received \$14,000 for a biology research laboratory; and the Rhode Island Hospital received funds for its cancer research facility.

Rhode Island is in the lead in establishing and developing a most interesting and vital long-term research attack to seek out the causes of cerebral palsy, mental retardation, and other neurological and sensory disorders of infancy and childhood—disorders which afflict 1 in every 16 children born annually in the United States. The investigators hope that the knowledge they gain will make it possible to prevent such disorders, and eventually enable every child to lead a full and useful life.

Expectant mothers, eventually 50,000 of them, will voluntarily take part in this study. During the mother's pregnancy and the child's life from birth until school age, conditions surrounding the child will be recorded, and the children themselves will be observed, examined, and tested. Brown University is one of the 16 leading hospitals or medical centers in the country collaborating on this project. I am proud and happy to say that six Rhode Island hospitals and centers are cooperating with the Brown University staff to gather information—Providence Lying-In, Providence District Nursing Association, the Emma Pendleton Bradley Hospital, the Meeting Street School, the Miriam Hospital, and the Rhode Island Hospital. All of these institutions are working with medical centers throughout the country as well as with the National Institutes of Health. Not only our children here in Rhode Island, but children throughout the Nation will share in the benefits that are certain to emerge from this study. It is more than possible that some of you are contributing data to this vitally important investigation, and I am sure you are aware of the part you are playing in this great undertaking.

Yes, Rhode Island is definitely becoming a center for health and research activities. In fiscal year 1960 there were 43 grants awarded by the National Institutes of Health for research projects in such places as Brown University, the University of Rhode Island, the Emma Pendleton Bradley Hospital, Providence College, the State department of social welfare, and others. The total dollar figure for these grants amounted to almost \$1,200,000. The range of investigations covered by these grants is broad—pharmacology, sanitary engineering, sensory diseases, behavioral sciences, cell biology, cancer chemotherapy, hematology, and more—a host of subjects revealing the breadth of interest and the scope of the abilities of our people and our institutions here in the State.

I think you can begin to see, now, why I told you earlier that I consider my committee assignment to be exciting, demanding, and satisfying. To me, there are few greater satisfactions than seeing my efforts translated into better hospitals, better health

centers, more scientists studying the causes and treatments of the diseases that threaten us, and better health, strength, and vitality for our great Nation.

If these efforts are to be truly meaningful, I find that I must continually be aware of the needs of the people, of the present state of biomedical research, of hospital facilities and construction, of the opportunities and needs for training, and of many more areas. I find that meetings with groups such as yours are of great value in maintaining my awareness of the attitudes, hopes, and aspirations of those who provide care and comfort for the ill.

Through groups such as yours, I shall continue to search for the best means of meeting the health needs of the people and to carry on the fight to translate these needs into law.

You and I are indeed fortunate. In our individual ways, we have opportunities to improve the health of the people. I know that the progress that you as an organized group have made is only a start for what you can accomplish in the years ahead. In these years, I look forward to a continued association with you as individuals and as a group. I earnestly solicit your advice, your ideas, and your support as they relate to my job; and I can assure you that you have my wholehearted support in behalf of your efforts.

Franking Privilege Too Excessive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, for years the Post Office has been operating at a sizable deficit. In order to eliminate this deficit and to enable the postal service to more nearly pay its own way, the House recently passed a bill to raise postal rates on several different classes of mail. While raising postal rates is neither pleasant nor popular, it was necessary, and the bill was passed.

During the debate, one class of mail came under especially heavy attack. I refer to third-class bulk mail, or the so-called "junk mail." Many members felt strongly that this class of mail was not paying its way, was placing a heavy burden upon the entire postal system, and should properly cost the sender more money. In the end, third-class rates were raised from 2½ cents to 3½ cents per piece and from 16 cents to 21 cents for bulk mail.

I find it difficult to approve of the action taken by the Congress when, in the waning hours of the last session, it voted itself the privilege of sending under frank mail addressed only to "Occupant." That this privilege is being and has been abused by Members is a matter of record. For example, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] has reminded us that when the Congress previously had this privilege one Member sent out over 4 million copies of a single speech. I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to repeal the franking authority granted Congressmen to send "Occupant" mail for the following reasons:

First, it defeats the purpose of the postal rate bill, and would add greatly to the expense of running the Post Office. Those who say it is cheaper to deliver mail with the simplified form of address do not realize that while this may be so in any given instance, the privilege invariably results in a much greater quantity of mail being sent. It is this increase in quantity which proves so costly in the long run.

Second, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has pointed out, the House folding room is simply not equipped to handle the greatly increased workload which is already being thrust upon it. Surely it does not make sense to bypass or delay mail addressed to constituents by name in order to handle a large batch of material destined for an unknown "occupant."

Third, I believe that most people would be offended to receive something from a Member of Congress who cannot even take the time to find out who they are or where they live.

Finally, I would call the attention of my colleagues to a privilege which is vital to proper representation—the right to send mail to constituents under frank. For the very reason that this privilege is so important, all necessary steps must be taken to insure that it is not abused. Use of this simplified form of address is an abuse, and will open the door to further abuses in the future.

FRANKING PRIVILEGE TOO EXCESSIVE

In this area of mailing privilege, as in all other areas, the Congress must lead and not follow. It must set an example for the country, and not seek to be an exception to rules which have been established for good and sufficient reasons. I strongly urge adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalms 51: 10: Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.

Almighty God, on this Ash Wednesday of our ecclesiastical calendar, may we be lifted by the mighty tide of Thy Holy Spirit into a blessed experience of the free and abundant life which must al-

ways be coordinated with self-denial and self-discipline.

Grant that this Lenten season may be a time of cleansing of heart and consecration of purpose and may all of its days be made great and glorious by a finer degree of spiritual culture.

Show us how we may gain the mastery over every insurgent impulse and every unworthy and inordinate desire, for we penitently confess that there are frequently such discrepancies between our professions and our practices, between our creed and our conduct, and that they are often at variance with one another.

Hear us in His name who was meek and lowly in heart. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AMENDING ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM AND REVISED ORGANIC ACT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 2774, to

amend section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam and section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, to provide for appointment of acting secretaries for such territories under certain conditions.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422b) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "The Governor or Acting Governor may from time to time designate an officer or employee of the executive branch of the government of Guam to act as secretary of Guam in case of a vacancy in the office of secretary of Guam or the disability or temporary absence of the secretary of Guam or while the secretary is acting as Governor, and the person so designated shall have all the powers of the secretary so long as such condition continues, except for the power set forth in the first sentence of section 7 of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person acting as Governor or as secretary under this Act."

SEC. 2. Section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497, 504; 48 U.S.C. 1596) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "The Governor or Acting Governor may from time to time designate an officer or employee of the executive department of the government of the Virgin Islands to act as government secretary for the Virgin Islands in case of a vacancy in the office of the government secretary or the disability or temporary absence of the government secretary or while said government secretary is acting as Governor, and the person so designated shall have all the powers of government secretary so long as such condition continues, except for the power set forth in section 14 of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person acting as Governor or as secretary under this Act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to vacate the proceedings whereby the House passed H.R. 10063 and to lay the bill on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPEAKER McCORMACK HONORED

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to announce to the membership of the House another honor that will be added to the long list of honors enjoyed by our beloved Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

In a fitting and moving tribute this morning, Speaker McCORMACK was presented the Distinguished Service

Award—1962, by the Massachusetts State Building & Construction Trades Council. It was presented to him by the national president of the council, Mr. C. J. Haggerty, and in the presence of Massachusetts delegates to the eighth annual council conference.

The Massachusetts congressional delegation, joined by Lawrence F. O'Brien, Jr., special assistant to the President for congressional affairs, gave eloquent oratorical testimony of the esteem and regard in which Speaker McCORMACK is held by his colleagues from his home State.

The resolution, honoring the Speaker, intoned on a magnificent plaque in fine word and phrase the unanimous feelings of the Massachusetts State Building & Construction Trades Council.

I am pleased to include it as part of my remarks:

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD—1962

Whereas the Massachusetts Building & Construction Trades Council is desirous of recognizing the achievements of a distinguished son of Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the National House of Representatives in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, able lawyer-legislator, enjoys the profound respect and esteem of the Massachusetts Building & Construction Trades Council for the support and encouragement he has given to our legislative programs and to progressive labor legislation;

Now therefore, we the Massachusetts Building & Construction Trades Council cite and publicly commend you, Mr. Speaker, for your 100 percent labor record; for your more than 40 years of dedicated service to Massachusetts, the Nation, and the world; for your patriotic devotion to the cause of freedom; and for the integrity, high purpose, and humanitarian principles that have guided you in public and private life.

Presented at the Eighth Annual Legislative Conference of the National Building and Construction Trades by the Massachusetts Building & Construction Trades Council on March 7, 1962, at the Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], has brought this matter to the attention of the House. I would like to add that I know of no person in all the history of this country who has a greater record for progressive and dedicated service than our beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives. I am delighted that he has received this well-earned recognition.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this announcement has caught me somewhat by surprise, which is probably understandable. But now that I know about it I want to join the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] in expressing, I am sure, the attitudes and the view of all of us over here that Speaker McCORMACK is indeed a great and fine person.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana.

TRIBUTE TO PETER RODINO, JR.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the leadership assumed by Peter Rodino, Jr., son of our colleague, the Honorable PETER RODINO, of New Jersey, should be an inspiration to all young people of this country.

It has been my pleasure to know Peter Rodino, Jr. I have learned from him of his enthusiasm to help carry out the people-to-people program that President Kennedy designated former President Eisenhower to head.

Understanding among people of nations throughout the world can start with children. That is the purpose of the little-people-to-people program inaugurated by Peter Rodino, Jr. This program has established personal contact and friendships among teenage Americans and many visiting foreign children. It has resulted in a hospitality operation and in exposing the views of the young people as to what America and the rest of the world may expect in the future.

It can result in better communications among school leaders and others. Naturally, this program is nongovernmental and nonpartisan.

It is promoting better understanding with every country of the world. It is demonstrating that the United States is a peace-loving country, that we are not aggressors, and that we desire to maintain the peace of the world.

DR. GEORGE N. PAPANICOLAOU

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to Dr. George N. Papanicolaou who died February 19 at his home in Miami, Fla.

In his sudden death, medical science and society as a whole have suffered a tremendous loss. No one has made a greater individual contribution to cancer control than this eminent American scientist of Greek origin. The simple examination procedure he developed for the early detection of uterine cancer, which has become widely known as the Pap smear, has saved the lives of thousands of women and is a vital tool in the cancer control program of the Public Health Service. Those of us serving on the Appropriations Committee have heard experts from the National Cancer Institute testify that complete application of this case-finding technique could

literally wipe out uterine cervical cancer as a killer of women.

Dr. Papanicolaou came to this country in 1913 with his wife, the former Mary Mavroyeni, his lifelong assistant in his experiments. He went to work in the Department of Pathology of New York Hospital and until late last year was a member of the faculty of Cornell Medical College.

Since the early 1940's, Dr. Papanicolaou had devoted his entire time to research on early cancer diagnosis through recovery and identification of cancer cells shed into body cavities. Last year he moved to Miami to become director of the Papanicolaou Cancer Research Institute.

Dr. Papanicolaou will always be remembered for the place he earned as a physician and scientist, and for his personal attributes of kindness and unselfish dedication.

SPEAKER CHAMP CLARK

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, March 5, 1962, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on March 7—112 years ago today—Daniel Webster closed an era in the Congress and the Nation with his notable "Seventh of March" speech.

On the same day, in a remote Kentucky community, there came to an obscure family, which at no time owned the roof above it, a son, James Beauchamp Clark, later to be known as Champ Clark, the 37th Speaker of the House.

In the brief time allotted here this afternoon we pass over the intervening years—years of absorbing interest and achievement—and consider for the time being only his unique and exceptional record as Speaker.

First. Of all the long and distinguished line of men who have presided over the House since the adoption of the Constitution, he is the only Speaker to be elected by a House controlled by the opposition party.

The 65th Congress consisted of 212 Democrats, 215 Republicans and 8 non-conformists, 7 of whom were ordinarily aligned with the Republicans and 1 with the Democrats. In that session the Republicans supported James R. Mann, of Illinois, one of the ablest men of all time in the annals of the American Congress, who was for 10 years minority leader. He and the newspapers and the country took for granted until after the rollcall started that his election was a matter of routine. But Clark was elected by a majority of 12 votes.

It had never happened before. It will probably not happen again in the next 500 years.

Champ Clark had been for 6 years Speaker of the House. He had been tested and tried. They knew him for what he was. They loved him and the country loved him. And a Republican House elected a Democratic Speaker.

The years passed by. A new generation arose "which knew not Jacob." But time cannot dim nor neglect obscure

the wonder and significance of that remarkable day.

Second. His fourth election tied him with that of Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois for the longest continuous service of any Speaker up to that time. The tenure of a Speaker is determined not so much by himself but by the predominance of his party in the House. If Speaker Garner had not accepted a place on the national ticket there is every likelihood that he would be Speaker of the House today. If the Democrats had retained control of a majority in the 66th Congress, Clark would without question have retained the speakership until his death.

Third. And in that respect also he established another record unique in the annals of the speakership. He was offered a seat in the Senate on the death of Senator Stone, a position "for which"—to use his own expression—"men pant as the hart panteth after the water brooks." He was offered a compromise at Baltimore under which he would have been Vice President of the United States—not merely a place on the national ticket but the positive assurance of election, as the Bull Moose candidacy of former President Theodore Roosevelt had hopelessly divided the Republican ranks. Each time he declined in order to remain in the House.

Fourth. He was the first and only Speaker to establish and maintain caucus rule. In January 1911—preliminary to the convening of the extra session, he issued a call for a Democratic caucus. It took the country by surprise. It was an innovation.

The newspapers uniformly derided the idea and called it Clark's crazy scheme. Their principle objection seemed to be that "It had never been done before." They predicted that no one would attend. But when he called the caucus to order, 2 days before the Congress convened, every Democratic Member of the House was in his seat except two who were ill. From that time on during the entire 8 years of his speakership, no important action was taken by the House until it had been officially submitted to the party as a whole and the party policy determined by a full and free discussion and vote in the caucus.

Fifth. With the single exception of Henry Clay, Clark is the only Speaker who himself developed the issue on which his party came to power. When he succeeded to the minority leadership of the House in 1908 the situation was desperate in the extreme. The crushing defeat of 1904 had left only one Democratic Governor outside the solid South. His party did not control a single branch of a single legislature north of the Mason & Dixon line. A scant two dozen Democratic Congressmen were returned to the House of Representatives from Northern and Western States following that disastrous campaign. To further complicate the difficulties of the situation, the Democratic Party in the House was torn and rent by internal schism and dissension. It was an extraordinary fact that for 16 years the Democratic minority had never voted as a unit on a single dominant question.

Confronted by this all but hopeless situation, Champ Clark rallied the shattered fragments of his party, placated the recalcitrants, fused hope into the discouraged, and disciplined his forces into a fighting minority which, in the spectacular battles of the 61st Congress, overthrew the autocracy of the Speaker, broke the iron ring that dominated the House, liberalized the rules, defeated the entrenched forces that had controlled legislation for more than a decade, and made possible the sweeping victories which gave his party a majority in the 62d Congress in 1910, and complete control of every branch of the Government in 1912.

The next morning after his election as Speaker, Senator John Sharp Williams, Clark's predecessor as minority leader, met Senator Ollie James on the steps of the Capitol and said "Ollie, it is the irony of politics. If I had stayed in the House I would now be Speaker." "Oh, no you wouldn't, John," said "Ollie cheerfully "if you had stayed in the House we would still be in the minority."

Sixth. Again, Speaker Clark is the only Speaker in the last hundred years who has not sought to enlarge and enhance the power of the speakership. Originally the functions of the Speaker were limited to those of a presiding officer. Jefferson in interpreting the Constitution and establishing procedure in the legislative branch of the new Government, as set forth in Jefferson's Manual, based his conception of congressional procedure on that of the English House of Commons in which the Speaker is merely a presiding officer—as he remains to this day. Originally the Vice President in the Senate and the Speaker in the House followed the British prototype. They made no effort to dominate their respective Houses or control legislation or extend their power and influence or otherwise manipulate the rules or encroach on the rights and authority reserved under the rules to other Members of Congress. In the Senate this situation still obtains. But beginning with Speaker Reed the Speaker and those cooperating with him began to reach out and mold the rules of the House to concentrate in the speakership such arbitrary control as to render him a dictator, disenfranchising, to that extent, the membership of the House to a point where under Speaker Cannon the President of the United States himself had to come to the Speaker's room, hat in hand, and plead as a mendicant before he could secure even the consideration of a bill needed by his administration.

The Senators wisely refused to permit alienation of their authority by such rules and availed themselves of policy committees and conferences which assured equal and independent participation of all in legislative functions of the body.

But in the House self-centered men concentrated dictatorial powers in the speakership. The movement had its inception under Speaker Reed and flowered under Speaker Cannon. And from their time Speakers have sought to make

themselves masters of the House. Speaker Clark fought determinedly, consistently, successfully to make the Speaker the servant of the House. He sought to encourage and enhance the individuality, independence, and legislative entity of every Member of the House and the constituency of the district which he represented. No caucus was adjourned until every man there had been given an opportunity to be heard and to present amendments or suggestions which he wished to offer. Sessions of the caucus frequently lasted until past midnight. It was truly a government by the rank and file of the membership of the House and not by the Speaker or any circle about the Speaker. It was the essence of Jeffersonian democracy.

Speaker Clark divested himself of all authority outside that of presiding officer and worked constantly for liberalization of the rules and the curtailment of the arbitrary powers of the speaker-ship emphasizing the supremacy of the caucus as the final authority on all party policies and national issues.

His insistence on this democratic course spread to the Nation and his battle against the domination of the Speaker and his coterie drew to his support an alliance of Republicans as well as Democratic colleagues. The press took it up. Magazines began to feature it. It spread like a prairie fire through the Nation and was the national campaign issue in the election of 1910.

Under the inspired leadership of Clark the rules were revised. The Speaker was deprived of all extraparliamentary power. Committees were elected by the House. Power of recognition was curtailed. The Speaker was made ineligible to membership on the Committee on Rules. The Calendar Wednesday rule and the Unanimous Consent Calendar were instituted and a Democratic caucus passed on all issues before consideration by the House. A united party presented a solid front and for the first time in 16 years swept to control of the House in that critical campaign and 2 years later took over every branch of the Government. No such rehabilitation of a helpless party; no such miraculous change in national sentiment is recorded in the political history of the Nation either before or since.

On this 7th day of March, on the 112th anniversary of his birth, we honor him in appreciation of those rare qualities which made him preeminently, incomparably the greatest of all Speakers, truly the servant of the House—never the master of the House.

Seventh. And let us not overlook the appeal of his statesmanship to the country. He came closer to the Presidency, without obtaining it than any man in American history. It was not a suddenly manipulated buildup. It was not an unforeseen stampede triggered by dramatic appeal to sentimentalism. It was the slow, steady growth through the years of the confidence and affection of the people for demonstrated capacity and integrity. Three men defeated him for the Presidency. No two of them could have accomplished it. It took all three—

widely separated geographically for widely separated motives.

From the first ballot at Baltimore in the Democratic National Convention of 1912, he led the entire field for 29 ballots with a clear majority on 9 ballots. He was the spontaneous choice of the Nation. But from ambush—with no opportunity to be heard, no chance to submit his cause—he was disinherited.

He comes down to us today as an illustrious archetype. His career is the glory of our democratic form of government. What he accomplished our children may hope to accomplish. What he achieved the humblest boy who walks the meanest street of the smallest hamlet in the remotest corner of the land may, under our free American institutions, aspire to achieve.

It was his pride, often voiced from public platform and from the Speaker's rostrum, that within the brief span of his life the example of the American Government had destroyed depotisms and established republics in every quarter of the globe; that with every other American citizen he had helped to make the blessings of liberty and democracy the common and universal birthright of all mankind.

On this 7th of March, in a critical international situation which he would have avoided, we look back to him with gratitude and appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to answer any questions which anyone desires to ask on this subject at this time.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 502 and ask for its immediate consideration.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Andrews	Hagan, Ga.	Plicher
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison, Va.	Powell
Buckley	Hoffman, Mich.	Rains
Cahill	Jones, Ala.	Scranton
Chelf	Kearns	Shelley
Curtis, Mass.	McDonough	Smith, Miss.
Davis	McIntire	Spence
James C.	Macdonald	Steed
Dawson	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Moulder	Whitten
Forrester	Norrell	Wright
Gavin	O'Konski	Zelenko
Granahan	Osners	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Ways and Means Committee may be permitted during the remainder of this session to hold meetings while the House is in session.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my chairman in that request. It is the usual request and has been the custom for at least 28 years that I know of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be privileged to sit during the legislative sessions on Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 132) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 552 calls up for debate and consideration House bill 132, the educational television bill. The open rule allows for 2 hours of debate.

At the outset I would like to commend the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for truly outstanding work on this bill. I

would also like to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], who first introduced the bill in 1957, and who has patiently and diligently worked on it through the years. I congratulate him on his great effort which brings the bill before the House for decision today.

The purpose of this bill is to encourage the States—through a program of matching grants—to take advantage of enormous opportunity and challenge of educational television.

This bill is intelligently and carefully written and, for a moderate cost, offers the Congress an opportunity to make a sound investment in the minds and future of our country's children as well as its adults.

But before discussing the specifics of the bill, I would like to sketch some of the background which will show the need for this type of legislation.

Beginning in 1952, the Federal Communications Commission first began making allocations on the broadcast spectrum for educational television stations.

As of July 29, 1961, the FCC had set aside 273 television channels for educational television. But during the last 9½ years, only 57 educational television stations have gone on the air, although 77 stations have been authorized.

In other words, only about 20 percent of the educational television allocations have actually been put into operation.

As my colleagues know, the demand for television channels is strong. And once all the allocations are made, there is little that can be done. As a result of the comparatively small use of educational television channels available, there has been an increased demand to take these channels away from educational television and reallocate them to commercial enterprises.

As the committee report on this bill stated:

There is a grave danger that unless the process of getting educational television stations on the air is speeded up, the demand to use these channels for commercial television purposes may become irresistible and thus they will be irretrievably lost to education.

I would like to point out that commercial stations have about 90 percent of the channel allocations. So this is not a question of depriving our valuable commercial media.

I should also like to quote one more paragraph of the committee report, with which I wholeheartedly agree:

The failure of educators to use reserved educational channels is not the result of lack of interest, desire, or planning on their part. One of the largest problems which faces the educators is the lack of funds to pay for the installation of educational television facilities. Experience has demonstrated that once educational television stations are built, State legislatures, local school systems, and community organizations have raised the necessary operating funds.

I am proud to say that my example is the great and truly outstanding record made in educational television by my own State of Alabama.

Alabama pioneered with the first and, so far to my knowledge, still the largest State educational TV network.

The network covers about 78 percent of the State's TV homes. The coverage is through channel 2 in Andalusia, channel 7 in Cheha State Park and channel 10 in Birmingham. Channel 26 in Montgomery will be connected to the State network before this spring.

Educational television has studios at Auburn University, the University of Alabama and in Birmingham. They are linked to the network by microwave.

More than 550 schools in Alabama have already purchased receiving sets. Most of these schools have made educational television an integral part of their program. And since 1955, educational television has been used for teaching shut-in children in Alabama. In all, more than 230,000 Alabama students receive some form of in-school educational television.

In addition to in-school telecasts, there are also after school programs for children. Other programs are designed for parent education and stress child growth and development and the importance of cooperation between home and school.

Of equal importance is the way educational television has opened a new frontier in adult education. Subjects covered include music, art and drama for cultural enrichment; vocational and agricultural programs aimed at improving earning power of our city and farm families and civic programs aimed at upgrading the awareness of our electorate.

The State legislature appropriates approximately \$225,000 a year for this program. With the help of this bill, Alabama is looking forward to expanding its educational television service to include the entire State.

Now, to discuss briefly the specific provisions of this bill.

The bill provides for two programs, both of them operated by matching grants.

First, a total of \$520,000 is authorized for the States to survey the need for and to develop programs for the construction of educational television facilities.

Second, a total of \$25 million is authorized for a program of constructing educational television facilities.

The maximum allowable to any State under the survey program is \$10,000. The limit to each State under the facility construction provision is \$1 million.

The survey grants would have to be matched dollar for dollar by the States. Construction grants are limited to 50 percent of the approved cost of the project.

The authorization for survey appropriations would be for 3 years, from July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1965. Funds for construction of facilities would be authorized for 4 years, from July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1966.

Those eligible for help under the bill are as follows:

First. An agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public education within that State or within a political subdivision thereof.

Second. The State educational television agency of a State.

Third. A college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues.

Fourth. A nonprofit community educational television organization.

Applications for both survey and construction grants must be first approved by the State educational television agency or officer before they can be forwarded to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner administers the Federal portion of the program.

In closing, I need not remind my colleagues at great length about the importance of education in the great twilight struggle between Western civilization and Communist tyranny.

This bill gives us an opportunity, at moderate cost, of pushing forward in a field where the investment yield is certain and the goals are unanimously accepted by the American people.

This bill specifically provides that none of its provisions shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employees of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system. In other words, the matter of the content of educational television programs of instruction is left in the hands of the States where it rightfully belongs.

I am happy that Alabama has forged ahead in making educational television programs available to its schoolchildren and to its adults. It is my hope that the growth of educational television in Alabama, and in the Nation, will be greatly quickened by this bill.

I urge adoption of House Resolution 552.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the issue before the House this afternoon is not on the merits of educational television. I think anybody that has made an objective and a thorough study of educational television could only come to the conclusion that it is a very important medium; that it does serve a very helpful function in the field of education.

The issue this afternoon here, as I see it, is twofold. No. 1: Is this a rightful responsibility for the Federal Government to assume; in other words, should the Federal Government trespass further into the field of education or should this remain, as it has historically, the responsibility of the several States?

The other issue is more or less indirect. It reverts, I think, to a bill or an issue which we had before this same body a few weeks ago. We had a proposal which would authorize an increase of the national debt limit by the amount of \$2 billion. We were advised simultaneously that there would subsequently be a further request to extend it an additional \$8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the most eloquent, the most persuasive and the most highly respected Member, the chairman of the

House Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], told the Committee on Rules that "a vote against raising the debt ceiling is not an economy vote; this is not the time to cast your economy votes. The time to cast an economy vote is when a new Federal authorization for additional Federal spending is being considered." That is a collateral issue here this afternoon.

With reference to this bill, this is not a new issue. It has been bouncing around the House of Representatives and before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and before the Rules Committee now for about 6 years. As you have already read in your report, and you were told by my colleague on the Rules Committee from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] this proposal has passed the other body several times. It has passed the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee now on two separate occasions. It failed in the Rules Committee in the 86th Congress. It was passed out of both the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee this year, and also the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, let us just look at this for a minute. Two years ago, in both the other body and in this body, we had a bill to authorize \$50 million for educational TV. That was considered to be a modest amount, and not an undue burden upon the Federal Treasurer. That was considered to be the minimum amount that could be authorized to generate, to accelerate, to initiate a program of educational television. Now, since that bill failed—the \$50 million bill failed—in the 86th Congress and we now have more budgetary concern, shall I say, by the majority party in the last year in view of the bookkeeping responsibilities downtown, we are back today with a \$25 million bill that can only mean one thing in my opinion, and that is this: We did not get the \$50 million bill passed; so we will start it out with \$25 million and we can build on that in Congresses to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a reality that we had just as well face here this afternoon. If we authorize this program today, even though it is for \$25 million, and it is limited under the bill strictly to the procurement of broadcasting apparatuses—this does not include brick and mortar and it does not include the cost of operation—but we had just as well face up to the fact if we commit the resources of the Federal Government for educational TV even to a limited extent this afternoon, at the expiration of the time provided for under this bill, which is 1967, somebody is going to be back on this floor or back before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and they are going to say this: "Mr. Chairman, now in my State we have a facility that was just half constructed. We underestimated the cost of this facility. Now it is in the public interest that the Congress should appropriate more money so that this particular facility in my State and in my congressional district can be completed."

Mr. Speaker, we are also going to have this situation, if the bill passes: Although

we are not committed to the cost of operation, Members will find in the hearings if they will read them—and I was on the Committee at the time the hearings were held—in some cases it costs as much as \$250,000 a year just to operate a television station after it is built.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only realistic to accept this afternoon that if we commit the Federal Government to the cost of construction, we are going to be asked in the not too distant future to also subsidize the cost of operations.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say again—I repeat—we are not voting on the issue of educational television. The issue before the House today is what is the responsibility of the Federal Government in this field as opposed to the traditional and rightful responsibility of the several States in the field of education.

I shall make only one further observation, Mr. Speaker. I should hope that the Members of the House, and later, members of the Committee of the Whole, will observe on page 16 that there is a rather broad authority under the bill as to who may qualify to apply for a television license, for a broadcasting license, to participate under this grant program. I shall not spell it out in detail, but I do want to call to your attention that it is not limited, as you might think. Members may be under the illusion that under this bill this authority is limited to an institution of higher learning, a college or university in your respective States or respective congressional district, but that is not the case. There is very broad authority in this bill as to who may apply for a broadcasting license.

The argument has been made further that not very many of the channels that have been reserved for educational purposes were actually now broadcasting and therefore, the only way to preserve these channels for education would be to hurry up and pass this bill so they will have a Federal incentive to put the station on the air.

Mr. Speaker, without burdening you with too many figures I would like to cite four very short and understandable statistics. There are presently 1,954 commercial channels that have been identified, UHF and VHF. Of these channels only 740 have actually gone on the air. These are commercial channels; 1,954 identified on the spectrum and set aside for commercial broadcasting, and only 740 of those have gone on the air.

What is the story with respect to education? There have been reserved, VHF and UHF, 273 channels. How many of them have gone on the air without any Federal aid? There have been 57—maybe 59; the committee report says 57, but it is my understanding that 2 have gone on since then. So actually, Mr. Speaker, the percentages are not too different for educational channels that have actually gone on the air than for commercial channels that have gone on since the spectrum was divided and channels were assigned in 1952, just 10 years ago, by the Federal Communications Commission.

Do not labor under the illusion further that the broadcasters, under this bill, are going to be under the direct supervision of the Federal Communications Commission, because they are not. After their license has once been awarded generally they will only be subject to such supervision as they would be under this so-called Commissioner which is identified as an appointee of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

On balance, therefore, I would say, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of support for this bill. I would urge the Members of the House to consider the basic issue before us; whether the Federal Government is going to trespass further in the field of aid to education. I think that is what we must ask ourselves before we vote on this bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from California who has been very active in the development of this legislation and is a ranking member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, is there anything in this bill that deprives the Federal Communications Commission of any of their regulatory authority over all licensees?

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The licensees, as many of the facilities as become licensed by virtue of the grants under this bill, would still be subject to all of the broad authority under the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as any other broadcasters. The gentleman is absolutely correct. But we are not in commercial broadcasting now. We are in a very critical field, a very sensitive field of educational broadcasting.

As much as I fear regulated broadcasting, I think there is also a calculated risk as to what is to be declared in the interest of education that might flow out over these facilities and what might flow out in the way of indoctrination.

Mr. YOUNGER. Is it not true that the FCC is charged in the regulatory authority with observing what is good and in the public interest? Is that not the criteria that they must use?

Mr. AVERY. Well, in a general sense, of course, it is, as the gentleman very well knows. There is no use going into this in detail. There are three or four prohibitions in the Federal Communications Act of 1934. Obscene language is not prohibited. There can be no lotteries, and as far as political broadcasts are concerned, facilities must be made available on an equal time basis. Censorship is forbidden. After the license has been granted the FCC, of course, has very little jurisdiction. I think that is the way it should be. In fact, there is a difference of opinion right now as to how far the Commission should project themselves into the field of program control. I am glad the gentleman is bringing this up because I think the House should realize the full ramifications in this proposal in which the Federal Government is providing part of the construction cost for a broadcasting facility and there is virtually going to be

no control over it. The question is going to rest almost entirely in the judgment of the licensee whether the program flowing out over the facility is going to be instructional or whether it is going to be indoctrinational. That is a hazard that we are facing, particularly, when the applicant is not limited to a college or a university facility.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill for matching grants to States for the construction of educational television facilities clearly prohibits the Federal Government from exercising any control over educational TV programs. This is as it should be. I never want to see the day when the Federal Government interferes with any phase of public or private education. That doesn't mean, however, that there should be no control over classroom TV.

State and local officials who inherit the task of selecting the content of educational television programs will have a very great responsibility to avoid one-sided indoctrination of a political nature which all too often commercial television networks feed their viewers under the guise of news. A blatant example of this reprehensible practice recently occurred on NBC-TV's popular "Today" program.

The moderator of this so-called news and entertainment show read a charge by the American Civil Liberties Union that "Operation Abolition," the Committee on Un-American Activities' film of the 1960 San Francisco riots, contains distortions. Although the ACLU represents strictly a very small minority viewpoint and has as a declared objective the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the moderator flatly endorsed the charge. Without any reference to reports by the House, the FBI or other sources which completely refute the ACLU's charge of "distortion" against the film, "Today's" moderator said:

We—I—agree with the statement of the American Civil Liberties Union.

I found the one-sided presentation's endorsement by an NBC spokesman on a news and entertainment show neither news nor entertaining.

This is the kind of practice which State and local education officials must keep out of the classrooms of the schools of America, if educational television is to have a constructive, rather than destructive, influence on our Nation's young people.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 132) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for

the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 132 with Mr. YATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this is one of the most important bills that will come before this session of the Congress. It affects the future of our country, the development of our children and the opportunities which they may have. Let no one be mistaken about the importance of this legislation.

Here we have a great natural resource. Without it we would not have some of the important news media we have today; without it we would not have means of defense we have today. Believe me, much of the progress and many of the advances that have been made, I can assure my colleagues, are due primarily to the availability of adequate communications.

Many of you have heard me say that in my judgment one of the most valuable natural resources we have in this country is the spectrum, and it is also one of the most wasted resources. For many years I have been trying to convince my colleagues and those interested in broadcasting of the importance of the efficient utilization of the spectrum. Because of conflicting views relating to the management of the spectrum, it is very difficult to get all forces together in order that the spectrum can be more efficiently utilized.

Just 5 years ago we tried through our committee to bring about unity of effort in the proper utilization of the spectrum; but, try as we would, it has been very difficult.

Our committee recognized the value in this portion of the spectrum reserved for educational television, and we bring to you by an overwhelming majority of the committee a bill which we recommend to you as being invaluable to the future of this country.

This bill was reported by our committee toward the close of the first session. Similar legislation was reported by our committee during the 86th Congress, and somewhat broader legislation passed the other body during the 85th, 86th, and again during the 87th Congress.

Now, let me tell you as briefly as possible what this legislation is about, and why it is even more important legislation today than it was last year and the year before.

We have in the United States 2,227 television channels. Of these channels, 1,551 are in the UHF band and 676 are

in the VHF band. Today, we have 458 commercial VHF stations operating on the 676 VHF channels, but we have only 85 commercial UHF stations operating on the 1,551 UHF channels. While most all VHF channels in the larger communities of our Nation have been taken up, many UHF channels in these same communities are still unused.

Now, a big drive is on at the present time to get new commercial UHF stations to operate on the 1,466 UHF channels which are still unoccupied. In order to accomplish this the FCC has proposed all-channel receiver legislation which will assure that all TV receivers shipped in interstate commerce are capable of receiving both UHF and VHF signals. Our committee has been conducting hearings on this legislation all this week.

Now, if the drive to get new UHF television stations on the air succeeds—and I personally have little doubt that it will in a very few years—then there will be a great demand that television channels which are now reserved for nonprofit educational purposes be made available for commercial purposes.

At present 92 VHF channels and 181 UHF channels are reserved for nonprofit educational broadcasting. But over the 9-year period during which these reservations have been in force, only 41 educational VHF stations and only 16 educational UHF stations have been established. If this process cannot be speeded up, there is good reason to fear that these channels will be reassigned for commercial television and thus be lost permanently for nonprofit educational purposes. The reason why the process of getting educational television stations on the air is so slow is lack of funds.

The bill before you attempts to address itself to this problem. First, the bill attempts to induce the States which have not already done so to make a survey of the need for educational television broadcasting facilities within these States, and to develop State programs for the construction of such facilities. The bill would make up to \$10,000 available to each State which desires to make such a survey and develop a construction program. This grant would have to be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Next, the bill authorizes a maximum expenditure of \$25 million for matching grants for the construction of educational television facilities. Not more than \$1 million may be granted for facilities in any one State. Appropriations for the program would cease June 30, 1966.

Applications for construction grants would be made through State agencies in those States which have developed a State program. They would be forwarded to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. In those States which have not developed a State program, applications would be made directly to the Commissioner.

In order to qualify, an applicant must be a State or local agency, or a college or university which derives its support in whole or in part from State tax reve-

nues, or it may be a local nonprofit community organization which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and cultural institutions in the area.

Applicants must satisfy the Commissioner that they have a license from the FCC or are qualified to be licensed, and that they are financially responsible. This means not only that they have the necessary matching money but that they also will have the necessary funds to operate the station.

Before the committee reported the bill, I wrote on behalf of our committee a letter to the Governors of our 50 States, inquiring with respect to any plans their States might have for the utilization of educational television, and asking their view whether the cooperative Federal-State program contemplated by this legislation might be helpful in furthering any such plans. Forty-five Governors replied. Thirty-one endorsed the legislation. Eleven expressed no opinion, two preferred reliance on private financing, and one expressed doubt as to the availability of matching funds in his State.

In summing up, let me say to you that this is important legislation because experience in a number of States has shown that educational television can be used advantageously to supplement classroom instruction. Some States have found that educational television can save them money because educational television has made unnecessary the construction of additional classrooms. Florida, particularly, testified at length on this aspect.

Undoubtedly, the use of educational television will grow whether or not we pass this legislation. However, the question is, will it grow fast enough to justify keeping unused a considerable number of television channels in those communities in which all available channels have been taken up by commercial stations, and where there is an insistent demand that educational channels be released for commercial purposes. It is the expectation that this bill, by offering a very limited amount of Federal matching grants, will have the desired result.

Now, let us discuss briefly the principal provisions of the bill, as amended in committee. This bill is patterned after the Hospital Survey and Construction Act—commonly referred to as the Hill-Burton Act. This act has proven very successful in stimulating, with the aid of Federal matching grants, the construction of numerous State, county, municipal, and private nonprofit hospitals throughout the Nation.

I have already referred briefly to the provision of the bill dealing with State surveys. The bill seeks to stimulate the making by the several States of surveys of the need for and the utility of additional educational television broadcasting facilities. It is expected that on the basis of such surveys, the construction of additional facilities will be developed. For this purpose, the bill authorizes a Federal grant of not to exceed \$10,000 to each State which desires to participate in the program. This grant must be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis by the State.

The survey must be made, and the State program must be developed by the State educational television agency. The bill defines a State educational television agency in such a manner as to permit existing State agencies to conduct the required survey and prepare the program. A State educational television agency may be:

- (1) A board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State; or
- (2) A board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law; or
- (3) A State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within the State, designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television.

Next, we come to construction grant applicants. Applications for construction grants are made through the State educational television agency and are transmitted by that agency to the Commissioner of Education in the case of an application for a facility situated in a State for which a survey grant has been approved under this program. Otherwise, applications are submitted directly to the Commissioner of Education.

In order to qualify for a Federal matching grant, an applicant must provide assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner of Education:

- (1) That the applicant is (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) the State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or (D) a nonprofit community educational television organization;
- (2) That the operation of such educational television facilities will be under the control of the applicant or a person qualified to be an applicant;
- (3) That necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain the facilities will be available when needed; and
- (4) That such television facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

The term "nonprofit community educational television organization" is defined for the purposes of this new part as meaning "a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations, located in the area to be served by educational television facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting."

In the case of any State with respect to which an application for a survey grant has been approved an application for the construction of a facility situated in such State may be approved by the Commissioner of Education only if such application has received the approval of the State educational television agency of such State. If a construction program for educational television facilities has been developed in such State, the application may be approved by the Commissioner only if the State educational television agency has certi-

fied that the facilities applied for are included in, or that construction thereof would be consistent with, such program.

Federal matching grants are limited to 50 percent of the amount determined by the Commissioner to be the reasonable and necessary cost of the project. However, if an applicant owns an existing educational television broadcasting facility and he desires a Federal matching grant for the construction of another educational television broadcasting facility or the enlargement or replacement of an existing facility, the Federal matching grant may be increased by adding to the 50 percent of the reasonable and necessary cost of the proposed project 25 percent of the reasonable and necessary cost, as determined by the Commissioner of all educational television broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant at the time of the filing of the application.

In computing the cost of a project there may be included the cost of acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus necessary for television broadcasting but there must be excluded the cost of constructing and repairing structures to house such apparatus. Thus, applicants must provide television studio buildings and other structures to house apparatus without any Federal aid.

Upon a determination by the Commissioner that an application for a construction grant meets the requirements set forth in this legislation, he may make a grant to the applicant.

As already mentioned, the total amount of construction grants for facilities situated in any State may not exceed \$1 million.

In order to qualify for a grant under this legislation, an applicant—or the operator, if different—must either already be licensed by the Federal Communications Commission to operate an educational television station, or he must be qualified under the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 and the Commission's rules to be so licensed.

The Commissioner is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this legislation.

The bill specifically provides that none of its provisions shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system. This prohibition also goes, of course, to the rulemaking powers of the Commissioner under section 397.

Finally, the bill authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this legislation as may be requested by the Commissioner.

The principal differences between the Senate-passed bill, S. 205, and the bill reported favorably by the committee are as follows:

First. H.R. 132 provides an authorization of up to \$25 million for up to 50 percent Federal grants with an overall

limitation of \$1 million for facilities situated in any one State. S. 205 provides an authorization for such amounts as may be necessary for outright Federal construction grants requiring no matching by applicants but there is a ceiling on individual grants of \$1 million for each State.

The committee believes that the requirement contained in this bill, that the Federal grant must be matched, should result in about the same number of facilities being constructed with approximately one-half the expenditure of Federal funds.

The committee also feels that without the matching requirement applicants for Federal grants might tend not to be as mindful as is necessary of the continuing financial responsibilities which they must assume in connection with the operation of educational television stations.

Second, H.R. 132 seeks to assist the States in the making of State surveys and the development of State plans for the construction of educational television facilities. No comparable provision is contained in S. 205.

The committee feels that the development of comprehensive State plans for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities will help to bring into proper focus the need for, and the prospective use of, educational television. The responsibility for the making of such surveys and the preparation of such plans should be placed on the appropriate State agencies or officers. This approach paid tremendous dividends in the case of the Hill-Burton program and it is hoped that similarly beneficial results will be accomplished under this legislation. Some of the States have already assumed a definite responsibility with regard to educational television and it is anticipated that if this legislation is enacted the remaining States will have an incentive to follow suit.

Third, H.R. 132 provides that in the case of any State with respect to which an application for a survey grant has been approved under section 392, an application for the construction of a facility situated in such State may be approved by the Commissioner of Education only if such application has received the approval of the State educational television agency of such State; if a construction program for educational television broadcasting facilities has been developed in such State, the application may be approved by the Commissioner only if the State educational television agency certifies that the facilities applied for are included in, or that construction thereof would be consistent with, such program.

S. 205 does not provide for any State screening of applicants and would vest complete discretion in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to the allocation of available Federal funds among competing applications within a State.

The committee feels that the maximum responsibility for screening applications under the program provided for

in this legislation should be placed in the hands of the States rather than the Federal Government.

Fourth, The provisions of H.R. 132 relating to the qualifications of applicants for construction grants differ in some respects from those contained in S. 205.

For example, under H.R. 132 an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public education within a political subdivision may qualify for a grant as well as an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public education within a State. Under S. 205 it is not clear whether an agency or officer within a political subdivision of a State would qualify.

The committee feels that agencies or officers responsible for the supervision of public education within political subdivisions should clearly qualify for Federal matching grants since developments to date have demonstrated that several such agencies or officers are now operating or are actively planning to operate educational television broadcasting stations.

Under H.R. 132 a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues may qualify to file an application. Under S. 205 a college or university may qualify only if it is State controlled. The committee feels that colleges or universities receiving State support should qualify for grants under this legislation in addition to State-controlled colleges and universities.

Mr. Chairman, those are the fundamental requirements of the bill. The purpose of the bill is to bring about the utilization of this great natural resource—the spectrum. I would say that this is the kind of a proposal that we all should be able to support. The issues that always provoke controversy in the field of education—those issues are not present here at all. It seems to me that the Congress could do no less than to try to provide a program for the utilization of this particular resource.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. In regard to that last point, Mr. Chairman, on page 7, where you list the agencies that might qualify, under section (D) where reference is made to nonprofit community educational television organization, could the gentleman inform the Members of the House what types of agencies or organizations might be included in that section which would not otherwise be covered in sections (A), (B), or (C)?

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman has the bill and will refer to "definitions" on pages 15 and 16, the gentleman can immediately see just what the committee does in this respect. We define the term "nonprofit community educational television organization" as a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or an association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic and cultural institutions, and organizations located in the area to be served by educational television broadcasting facilities, and which

was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

The gentleman from Kansas mentioned something that is vital in this field. I do not want anyone to get the wrong impression as to what the committee intended or what we did. The committee provided language as specific as it could. The language was offered, I think, by the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER]. It is on page 17 and I should like to read this language.

SEC. 398. Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system.

That, it seems to me, nails down this question and there certainly should not be any serious argument on it.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a good bill and I urge the members of this Committee of the Whole to give it their overwhelming support.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I want to be very frank with the membership of this House. When our committee first held hearings on educational television bills, I felt that at that time the Federal Government could not afford the additional financial burden which such a program would impose on it. However, I have had occasion to change my mind in this respect and I want to share with the Members of the House the reasons why I now support this proposal.

After our committee held hearings during the 85th Congress, it was felt that the information presented by the witnesses was not sufficient to guide the committee in its decision with regard to this legislation. Therefore, the committee decided to make an on-the-spot study of educational television and I participated in this study. I learned in the course of the study the importance of educational television which has caused me to change my mind with regard to this bill.

In the first place, educational television affords an opportunity for utilizing the services of scarce teachers in the fields of languages and the sciences to teach many more students than is possible by traditional classroom instruction. Second, educational television can save large sums of money by making unnecessary the construction of some additional classrooms. This was exemplified particularly in Miami where you have a tremendous increase in student enrollment in the public schools and where the utilization of educational tele-

vision made possible a cutting back of the building construction program which otherwise would have been necessary. Thus, the State of Florida and the communities involved saved many millions of dollars. Third, the bill which the committee has reported is much different than the bill originally considered. The original bill provided for an outright grant program without any matching requirements and it left large discretionary authority to the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

The bill which the committee has worked out provides for a matching grant program following the pattern of the Hill-Burton Act. It requires State plans and thus gives a large share of the responsibility and discretion for the administration of the program to the States rather than the Federal Government.

Finally, the bill as reported cuts back the amount authorized to slightly in excess of \$25.5 million instead of the \$52 million which was authorized by the Senate bill.

For all of these reasons, I feel that this legislation, which involves a modest expenditure of Federal funds, is beneficial to the Nation as a whole. Improved education and information, both for our children and our adult population is vital to the welfare of the Nation. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I know there has been some doubt in the minds of those on my side of the aisle as to what the difference is between this bill and the Senate bill. I think chiefly it has to do with the amount of money that is allotted for this particular project. The Senate bill has \$50 million with \$1 million going to each State. In other words, that is the mandatory feature of the bill. There are no incentive provisions for local assistance to the States in the Senate bill. Our bill, we believe is an improvement over the bill passed on the Senate side, because of the incentive provisions.

Let me say to my colleagues that if this bill passes and we go to conference I hope our committee will stand firm on this particular incentive provision because I believe it is of considerable importance.

In this bill we have allotted \$25 million to States for this kind of effort in the educational TV field with the provision that not more than \$1 million may go to any State. That is the maximum. This, in turn, means that if you hand an average of \$500,000 to each one of the States now, and each of them took advantage of this they would in turn have to produce or vote \$500,000 out of their own pocket. In other words, if this \$25 million is fully utilized under the provisions of the bill then the States themselves must match that \$25 million. That is the kind of matching program that we have had in other types of matching legislation which has come from this committee; and I could go back over some of them through the years begin-

ning with the Hill-Burton Act which originated in this committee.

I think this is a good provision and I think those States that are actually interested in promoting educational television have the incentive here, if they want to undertake it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Just for the correction of the record, I believe that the matching funds can be furnished by the public rather than through the State if there is some educational institution that qualifies and they raise the funds by public subscription; is that not true?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is true. But whoever did it, I presume, there would have to be a division set out under the provisions under the bill.

A great many have asked—what is the need for this. It seems to me that the need for increasing the quality as well as the quantity of education available was never more evident than it is at the present time in this particular field. There is a constantly growing body of knowledge which can be disseminated by educational television. There is a constant increase in the interrelationship of our people with the rest of the world that necessitates a greater understanding than can be achieved only by the opportunities of learning at the university level.

We believe that the provisions of this bill will do much to fill this void. During the past few years, 65 educational television stations which are now on the air in various parts of the country have fully demonstrated to us the efficiencies in providing quantity instruction as well as the effectiveness of using educational television as a medium for the improvement of this kind of instruction.

The evidence that has been presented by all of the national educational television agencies to our committees as well as the U.S. Office of Education indicates that not only is this use of television for educational purposes effective, but it is an extremely economical way of achieving an objective that apparently in many areas of the country could be achieved in no other way. We have a limited number of qualified teachers in higher education, and one of the demonstrated economies effected by the use of educational television has been the sharing of exceptionally qualified teachers and professors in specific subject areas with great numbers of students who would otherwise be denied the privileges of these contacts.

But, in addition to this, there has been demonstrated collaterally an equal advantage from the proper and effective development of educational television. The Commission appointed by President Eisenhower on National Goals said in its report commenting on the needs of continuing education:

If we really believe in individual fulfillment, our concern for education (in the television field) will reach far beyond the formal system. We shall expect people to continue to learn and grow, in and out of

school, in every possible circumstance, and at every stage of their lives.

This simply means in addition to providing facilities for the increasing needs of formal education, we as a people must use every resource such as educational television to make available a process of continuing education that will enable our people to meet intelligently and successfully the problems and the pressures of present day life.

The evidence on every hand indicates that several States have made tremendous efforts to provide these educational facilities, and the fact that the majority of the States have provided some kind of central authority in the educational TV field or have made some kind of plan, depending on their financial ability to develop these plans, indicates the recognition of the need for educational television facilities at the local levels. It has been demonstrated that once facilities can be established and their use properly integrated into the educational processes of the localities that actual financial savings will accrue, but the problem seems to be in getting the initial investment underway and this is where this Congress can serve best. For a very small amount of money, seed money if you will, the ball can be started rolling in every State, and local and State and even private funds will be made available to match this initial Federal money to provide this Nation with the kind of auxiliary educational television facilities which can help greatly.

The very significant fact about such help is that these facilities are available in their use to all the people through this bill; to all citizens of all ages and for all areas of learning for the relatively small sum of money required to set this in operation. Congress cannot afford to withhold the initiative and encouragement which will make possible the development of one of the most significant tools of education, educational television, and of general public understanding that has been developed within our time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to yield further time?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132. The program to be authorized by this bill could be extremely beneficial to very large numbers of people in a great many areas, particularly in rural areas where population and distances tend to discourage supplemental educational and cultural activities. Furthermore, the program to be authorized by H.R. 132 is completely a voluntary program. I think this is an extremely important factor. There must be local interest and initiative demonstrated before any Federal funds would be expended.

In Colorado, we already have some excellent examples of both local interest and local initiative which have been dramatically demonstrated. One of the country's outstanding educational TV stations, KRMA, is located in Denver.

And, since 1956, it has served the schools of that area in addition to providing noncommercial programs for children and adults.

The University of Colorado, which is located in Boulder, currently is seeking funds with which to establish an educational television station in that area. Channel 12 already has been reserved for this station. In addition, channels have been reserved for educational television stations which are planned for the cities of Colorado Springs and Pueblo.

Two years ago, our State legislature passed a bill to enable our school districts to operate television facilities. Implementing this authorization, the University of Colorado offers courses in television production and has produced programs on commercial TV stations. Colorado State University, which is located at Fort Collins, also offers courses in television production, and likewise has produced programs on commercial television stations. Courses in television production also are offered by the University of Denver.

Currently available to the viewers of educational television in the Denver area are such elementary school courses as foreign languages, literature, science, social studies, mathematics, and geography. For older students and adults, the programs offered include typing, home economics, and college algebra in addition to public affairs and a variety of cultural programs which are produced locally.

Thus, in Colorado, much of the groundwork already has been done, and the enactment of H.R. 132 could stimulate the creation of a statewide system of educational television in our State.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 132 represents a sound progressive advance in the national educational effort. It will permit the use of television for truly constructive purposes—enabling us to realize some of the great potential values of this medium for communication.

Furthermore, H.R. 132 meets the tests for action by the Federal Government. The House bill assists the States in making surveys and plans for the construction of educational television facilities.

The responsibility, however, remains with the States. The grants are made on a matching basis—thus stimulating State action in this important endeavor. The States will have the prerogative of screening applications for construction of educational television facilities—selection will not be made by the Federal Government.

Lastly, the construction of such facilities is a matter which the people in many parts of the country cannot accomplish for themselves. It therefore is appropriate for the Federal Government to help do the job.

In States such as my own, with relatively small populations and mountainous terrain, UHF television transmission facilities cost more than can be afforded locally. For instance, an appropriate facility for Vermont would cost about

\$1,700,000 according to a recent survey. Yet such facilities are vitally needed if the public's educational level is to be raised.

I am proud to say that Vermont's present lone television station has demonstrated the use of this medium for courses in mathematics, science, social studies, and other subjects with great effectiveness for the people of our State.

I hope this bill passes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to acknowledge the kind words from my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], who handled the rule on this bill; and I would like to compliment our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, on the fine presentation he made on this bill.

The bill H.R. 132 I am happy to sponsor is the result of many years of hearings and studies and intensive investigations.

It has been before the Congress for many years and was first introduced in the other body by Senator Bricker of Ohio, and Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, and reintroduced and enthusiastically supported and sponsored by the late Senator Schoeppel of Kansas. It has twice passed the Senate, with little or no opposition in the form of direct grant legislation and has been considered by the House for several years.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, favorably reported the bill on August 18, 1958, but because Congress adjourned shortly thereafter the House was unable to take action on the bill. During the 86th Congress the Senate again passed an educational television construction grant bill—S. 12. Our committee held extensive hearings on the Senate-passed bill, and on several bills in Washington, D.C.; Birmingham, Ala.; San Francisco, Calif.; Denver, Colo.; Tampa and Miami, Fla.; Atlanta, Ga.; Topeka, Kans.; New Orleans, La.; Raleigh, N.C.; and Seattle, Wash.

The bill before the House today is the result of long study and full hearings and many private investigations by Members of this body. I take no pride of authorship in the bill and I have no selfish personal interest in the bill, because my own State of Alabama has done a splendid job and we have one of the finest networks in the United States, with coverage of perhaps more than 85 percent of our population. But I do feel this is a very important activity and that the Congress has a responsibility.

We find today only about 20 percent of these allocations have been utilized. We need to exercise some Federal leadership in order that we may make this very fine educational tool available to our children and to their children. Certain it is in this day when we are trying to close not only the gap in the science of space, we are not only trying to do that, but we are trying to stay ahead of the Communist bloc in every aspect of our being, it seems to me it is inevitable and absolutely tragic if we would deny the

full utilization of this most available educational tool.

I believe this bill is a very sensible, conservative approach to the problem. I believe it has every built-in protection this great committee is capable of writing into a piece of legislation to insure there will be no Federal interference and that the State will control at all times the use of this educational medium.

I will not try to convince anyone that educational television is a very useful and highly wonderful instrument, but I would like to recall, or at least tell the committee about a morning in September about 2 years ago. I visited one of the grammar schools in Birmingham, Ala., along with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI]. We visited this school where 9- and 10-year-olds were learning effectively the Spanish language.

I might also tell you that in my State of Alabama, so far as I know there is only one teacher of Russian available in our State. Yet that teacher's ability has spread throughout the more than 400 or 500 schools in the State of Alabama to more than 200,000 students. This means these students are getting advantages that were not to be found in many of the more sophisticated schools in the country.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. First, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] for bringing such an important piece of legislation as this to the floor, and likewise congratulate the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has worked long and diligently for this legislation and the Nation can be proud of his efforts.

There are a couple of questions that I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama. It is my understanding that the Kentucky General Assembly recently enacted legislation authorizing the issuance of revenue bonds to assist in financing the construction of educational television stations in Kentucky. As I read H.R. 132, there is no provision which would prevent a State from utilizing the funds derived in this manner for the purpose of matching Federal funds, even though service charges to educational agencies using the facilities would be made and pledged for the retirement of the bonds.

Now, am I correct in assuming that the Federal grants under this program would be available for such purpose?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I know of no prohibition in this bill against using the funds you mentioned as credit, and in my humble opinion, under the reimbursable section of the bill, Kentucky could use these funds as part of its credit for Federal funds.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, there is one further question. I have contacted the Federal Communications Commission, and I notice reference to it in the hearings, and I have been advised, based on applications, Federal Communications Docket 14396, there is indication that

if and when approved by the Federal Communications Commission UHF channel reservations for educational purposes will be made for the following eastern Kentucky communities: Ashland, channel 59; Hazard, channel 19; Morehead, channel 24; Pikeville, channel 14.

Have these channels been set aside for educational television?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. May I ask the gentleman if that came from the table of allocations by Chairman Minow in his statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. It is my understanding they have; that it would include the list of cities you have read.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to again compliment the distinguished gentleman for sponsoring such a splendid piece of legislation and to congratulate the educational authorities in his home State, to be perhaps the first State of the Union to take advantage of the limited amount of funds made available under the National Defense Education Act for educational television. Of course, that act was sponsored by two distinguished Alabamians, Senator HILL, and a Member of this House, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

I would like to add one or two other things. I go back to the inception of educational television in my State. I think it was due to the farsightedness of one of our Governors, Gov. Gordon Persons, who had a lot of training in communication, and to the commission which he established, particularly to Mr. Raymond Hurlburt, who is the director of our educational television commission. We have a staggered system of appointment; it is a nonpartisan body, and I think it has worked quite well in our State of Alabama. Especially do I appreciate the splendid work of our educational TV commission in Alabama who have worked so hard to make educational television work for the benefit of all our people—comprising this board are the following: Maynard Layman, president, Decatur, Ala.; Vincent Kilborne, Mobile, Ala.; Mrs. Bertha Roberts, Gadsden, Ala.; Bob Harper, Montgomery, Ala., and Harold Purdy, Birmingham, Ala.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the House at this time, H.R. 132, to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes, merits my wholehearted support.

Communications are the arteries which bind society together. Radio and TV have, in many instances, proved themselves effective educational tools. Educational television has reached be-

yond the classroom curriculum, but it has not yet reached far enough beyond. Endless dimensions of opportunity invite imagination and planning for the development of its potential. President Kennedy in his education message of February 21, 1961 said:

Our twin goals must be a new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing to pursue it.

Television can play a tremendous role in increasing the excellence of education and will provide availability to all in a manner that is unequaled by any other medium. This already has been demonstrated at all levels of education, from the primary grades through adult education, and in virtually all subjects in which it has been reasonably tried.

Since 1956, the Chicago Board of Education, through the Chicago City Junior College, has been utilizing broadcast television to bring a unique educational service to the residents of Chicagoland. It has provided college instruction to people living in a radius of 50 miles of Chicago. Although the average semester enrollment is nearly 5,000 students, an additional audience, which averages 5,000 to 35,000, is also viewing each telecourse broadcast.

Of the 5,000 enrollment, the average semester enrollment for credit was 1,261 students, who registered for a total of 2,321 courses, or nearly 2 courses per person. If all of these people were gathered into a conventional college, a campus costing several millions of dollars would be required.

In a 3-year experiment by the Chicago City Junior College, it proved that it was possible to present a complete junior college curriculum on open-circuit television, and with it reach an appreciative and highly motivated student body, many of whom would otherwise be unable to go on with their education; and that it is possible in this kind of teaching to maintain classroom levels of instruction and student performance.

In evaluating what can be learned through TV education, a 3-year research was made comparing home TV to classroom study. The results showed no significant difference in English, social science, political science, mathematics, accounting, while more learning from TV resulted in classes of biology, physical science, and humanities.

We, in Chicago, are proud of this accomplishment by the Chicago Board of Education.

But can the same be accomplished in the primary and secondary levels of education? In October of 1959, I was a member of a special subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which conducted an educational TV study in the Southeast portion of our country. The committee visited the States of North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, and Florida, where special hearings were conducted to determine the value of education using the medium of television.

Many educators, public officials, and civic-minded people, who were directly involved in experiments using television as a means of supplementing their pres-

ent academic program, appeared at these hearings. The evidence they produced showed that television could increase the learning of boys and girls. They were most enthusiastic in accepting it as a part of their curriculum.

These communities have been able to finance these experiments with private support including that from great foundations, but to broaden the scope it requires large sums in order to make it available to every section of the United States where it is needed and can be useful.

Television will not replace teachers. However, it multiplies the effectiveness of the good teacher by enabling him to reach a great many more pupils, some of whom would otherwise have only mediocre instruction. It tends to equalize the educational opportunities of the children of an area, regardless of size or location of the school.

It can assist the "slower" student in grasping the meaning of a lesson because the camera can magnify small objects, present close-ups of a demonstration, a map or an object of interest, and give everyone "a front row seat." The visual impact at the moment of explanation sharpens the learning process. And with highly organized presentations, more subject matter can be covered in less time.

The States have shown their eagerness to participate in the program we are now considering. There are TV channels set aside for educational purposes. However, there is a grave danger that, unless the process of getting educational television stations on the air is speeded up, the demand to use these channels for commercial television may become irresistible and thus they will be irretrievably lost to education.

The legislation we are considering is to assist—through matching grants—the several States to survey the need to develop programs for the construction of educational television facilities; and to assist—through matching grants—in the construction of educational television facilities. It deserves the full support of this Congress. I urge that this bill be passed.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] has just stated, our subcommittee had the opportunity two years ago to make quite an extensive study of educational television, particularly in watching ETV in operation in many of the high schools and grade schools in the Southern States. There is no question that this medium is a reservoir largely untapped today in the field of education. In almost every area where we conducted these hearings we did, however, find certain opposition to the Federal Government injecting itself into this program. We went into many schools where classes were being conducted via the television screen. In some cases in discussing the matter with the students themselves we found that they enjoyed learning on television more than they did in the usual classroom manner.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding also that statistics show that the final examinations taken by students who took various courses on educational television were equal to those who had personal classroom instruction. I do not think there is any question that we all agree that television today has a tremendous potential as a tool in the field of education; that notwithstanding the fact there are certain problems presented in legislation of this nature. I would hope that perhaps some of these questions could be clarified in the course of our discussion here this afternoon.

For example, I do not know, as a member of the committee, just how the equal time concept, as adopted and which is now written into the regulations of the FCC through legislation, would apply in this field of educational television. There are some other built-in problems in dealing with a subject of this nature that are not just as simple as the wording itself.

Mr. Chairman, I am also frank to make this further observation: In the course of the hearings that we conducted in schools, including the junior colleges and in those areas where in-school television is used as part of the regular teaching curriculum, we found no one representing the major educational association of this country officially testifying for or against this legislation, and I refer, of course, to the National Education Association. Time after time in the hearings that were held about the country I, personally, asked if there were representatives of the local State education association present to testify and to set forth their support or protest of this legislation. In no case did they appear to give such testimony. It, I might say, is quite surprising to me, that the major educational association in the country has not taken a stand on a bill or on legislation which is of such vital importance to the future of education in America. I hope, however, that the Members of the House, recognizing the great potential of the use of television in improving our school systems will not gather any idea that this is automation of the teaching profession, because it most certainly is not.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the membership of the House support like legislation now pending before us.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct a couple of additional questions to the chairman of the committee. Is it likely that we can build anywhere in the United States an educational television broadcasting station for much less than half a million dollars?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would not want to appear in any way as an expert on the cost of broadcasting facilities. I do think that I have enough knowledge of the subject, however, that I may say that the cost of a station generally would depend largely on the extent of the broadcasting facility. In other words, I will say to the gentleman that if someone wanted to have a station, after they got a license, which has

low power—a very small station of that kind—and then went out and obtained some used equipment that might be considered obsolete, they could very well construct a station for less than the figure the gentleman mentioned. But generally speaking, if we are going to have adequate facilities and modern facilities such as are required now we feel that anything like a station adequate to serve the public would cost in the neighborhood of half a million dollars.

Mr. KYL. And the cost of operation is considerable, too, is that not correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. KYL. In other words, what the gentleman from Iowa is trying to do at this time, Mr. Chairman, is to bring a note of practicality into this debate. Is it likely, Mr. Chairman, that any institutions other than universities or communities other than large ones would be able to establish these systems at this time?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; I will say from the experience we already have that such facilities are operating in a few communities. As an example, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] was here a few moments ago. His hometown of Monroe, La., which would be considered, generally speaking, a rather small municipality, does have very good educational television facilities. The same is true of other places that I could refer the gentleman to; Lowell Institute, WGDH, is a station of that kind in Detroit, and the University of Detroit is a member of a group operating WTVS.

Mr. KYL. But the gentleman would agree that this is simply a beginning in the amount of money necessary; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, I would say that.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, maybe I did not fully understand a question asked by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL], the last question he propounded, and perhaps my answer was not correct.

Mr. KYL. I think the response was as you would desire. I did not think we should leave the impression with every community in the country that with the funds in this bill they would now be able to go out and establish a community television system.

Mr. HARRIS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. As a matter of fact that could not be done, because there are only relatively few assignments for this purpose at present. If additional assignments are made, and if and when UHF really gets underway, then I think it would make for a different situation and we would have many more stations and may have an opportunity for a truly national educational network.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because of a peculiar situation which exists insofar as my native State is concerned. When this legislation was presented to the committee because of the success that the State of

South Carolina had had in pioneering educational television, I supported the legislation.

Because of the peculiar circumstances and because of our ambitions to do the best job—which we have done—we did not try to utilize the four UHF allocations which the Federal Communications Commission had allocated for educational purposes in South Carolina. We recognized the fact that those particular stations would be unable to cover, if utilized to full capacity, over one-third of the territory of the State of South Carolina. For that reason, among others, we developed a closed circuit television system which is inferior to none. Now on a UHF station you can only present in any given hour one particular program. With the cooperation and assistance of the telephone companies and the ITT, we were able to develop a cable with which we are able to transmit at any one time a number of different programs into the same school over the same cable. So we have a system in which we can transmit from the educational television center in Columbia, S.C., into schools over the system algebra, French, Spanish, and various other subjects all at the same time.

What we are saying here today, unfortunately, and I am going to offer an amendment which I hope will be accepted, is that this is for the purpose of utilizing the UHF stations. That may be one of the purposes, but unless the purpose of this legislation is educational, then we have aborted the intent, and while I would use all the UHF allocations we might have, if you investigate you will find out, as is the case in my native State, in order to reach everybody you want to reach, you are not going to have enough stations. It would take us more than 40 stations, I believe, to cover the State of South Carolina.

We have another peculiarity, perhaps a blessing. The commercial stations give us time. They give us time, recognizing the fact that commercial stations, particularly the VHF stations, can reach not only into the schools where we are seeking to develop this process of education, but it also reaches the general public who may wish to be advised of the courses. If you will look at page 44 of the hearings, there is an explanation contained there of the advantages of the closed-circuit system for not only the dissemination of different programs, but the advantages of efficiency. Therefore, I am going to offer an amendment, because this has been proven to be so efficient and so beneficial to the States in using this particular program, that they be included. Otherwise, we say to those States which have developed this very efficient system, we recognize the need, perhaps, to develop the UHF allocation but we are going to make education the primary purpose of this legislation and we are not going to neglect the educational purpose which is the real purpose. We have found in our experimentation and in utilization as a practical matter we can develop the ability to learn and the ability to absorb in the students themselves. We

have taken the students who have had the benefit of educational television in our State and given them tests and examinations to make sure that this particular form of instruction has superior qualities, and it does have superior qualities.

It is not only taught in the classrooms, it is supplemented by the teacher who is trained for that particular purpose.

We have a Dr. Kalmbach who is in charge of our program, and with the Commissioner of Education, I visited the facilities at Columbia, S.C., and we watched them make some of the program tapes. We watched the instruction carefully. The results of that method of instruction are most encouraging, for not only do the children see a visual application of the principles, but it promotes their ability to use the language they study as it is spoken to them.

So I am going to offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman, in order to say to those people who have done such a good job that we recognize that what you need is to extend the effort. We also recognize that if we use a UHF station instead of a closed-circuit television it would cost my State more money, we would have less efficiency and poorer programs and a lesser possibility of getting the job done that we seek to do.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. Do I understand the gentleman wants to include closed-circuit facilities?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I propose to include the apparatus used in connection with closed-circuit television. In my opinion the bill would include them all, but I want to make sure and clarify it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Insofar as the closed circuit is concerned they do not have to get a license from the FCC. The Federal Government has no control over their licensing or broadcasting through the use of closed-circuit television.

Mr. HEMPHILL. They do have the same control they have over the UHF stations, but they still would be using communications facilities over which the Federal Government does have control. The gentleman assisted in writing this legislation. I am happy to say. The Federal Government should not have the control—the States should have, and that is in this legislation. The States are in control insofar as programs and curriculums are concerned.

I include here an article on the South Carolina effort:

SOUTH CAROLINA POINTS WAY TO MULTI-CHANNEL TRANSMISSION

One of South Carolina's major contributions to the development of ETV has been in the use of closed-circuit distribution for wide geographic areas. Where closed-circuit television has been used in other States, it has been largely within the confines of a single school or college. South Carolina advocates saw at once that the open-circuit station may be forever limited to 1 channel, meaning that there could never be more than 12 half-hour subjects a day, or an average of only 1 subject for each class. Furthermore, only four open-circuit

educational stations had been allocated to the State by the FCC, with an effective geographical coverage of only a third of the State.

With these limitations in mind, South Carolina investigated the possibility of closed circuits through existing and planned facilities of the telephone companies. It was known only that closed-circuit TV would allow as many channels with as many subjects as might be desired with excellent reception at every point.

The difficulty was that there were no closed-circuit educational television networks in the Nation, and no telephone company anywhere had cost figures for educational TV. In short, ETV advocates in South Carolina were seeking information that did not exist.

This problem, however, was to become an immediate challenge to Walter G. Edwards, general manager of Southern Bell Telephone Co. in South Carolina, and other top men both in the Bell System and among the independent companies of the State. A force of engineering and cost experts was assigned to a concentrated study, working day and night for many weeks pioneering in rates which had not been explored anywhere else in the world.

State Superintendent of Education Jesse T. Anderson and the late Dr. C. B. Seaborn of the State education department staff cooperated in the preparation of special maps of every county, precisely locating every public school in the State.

The result was that the legislature could be shown that every high school in the State, a total of 413, could be served with 3 channels of broadcasting, offering 36 daily half-hour subjects, at an average cost of \$12.67 per pupil a year. This cost also included the studios and transmission lines for the 3 summer months as well as afternoon and evening hours whenever needed year round for a wide variety of educational services at all levels.

The legislature was so impressed that it appropriated all that was asked for the 1960-61 school year, when the South Carolina system went statewide. The \$643,000 appropriation enabled the system to expand to 31 high schools in 11 counties using 1 channel via closed circuit. More than 60 schools volunteered to receive some of the subjects offered through cooperating commercial stations as a public service.

Thus began the first statewide closed-circuit system anywhere. In 1961-62, the legislature appropriated \$800,000, doubling the number of counties, schools, and subjects offered. No funds other than State or county appropriations have been used in the South Carolina project.

Recently, the South Carolina closed-circuit concept was put to two long range tests. Upon invitation of the South Carolina Education Association, the ETV Center agreed to prepare an exhibit for the annual meeting of the National Education Association in Atlantic City, N.J.

The ETV staff decided to broadcast directly from the ETV Center in Columbia to the headquarters hotel in Atlantic City. It took some doing, but it was done. For 5 days, the closed-circuit system delivered 5 hours a day of programs from Columbia to the South Carolina NEA booth, plus taking over a vacant channel in the hotel's TV system, permitting the South Carolina programs to go into all of the hotel receiving sets in lobbies, meeting rooms, and bedrooms. A special talk-back system permitted viewers in Atlantic City to ask questions during the unique question and answer programs that were held daily. Not once during the 5 days was there the slightest interruption of service, and thousands of educators from every State had the opportunity to view ETV beamed with perfect clarity from South Carolina to New Jersey.

Lately, Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, of South Carolina, accepted an invitation from Govs. Price Daniel, of Texas, and Buford Ellington, of Tennessee, for the South Carolina ETV Center to broadcast directly from Columbia into the hotel meetingroom of the southern Governors' conference in Nashville, Tenn. Again there was a flawless 30-minute broadcast outlining the South Carolina ETV concept for the 18 southern Governors and their staffs.

At this Governors' conference, the receiving sets which had been installed for the South Carolina ETV broadcast also were to be used to tune in on a commercial station to bring to the Governors a speech by President Kennedy before the United Nations. Shortly before the President's address was scheduled to start, the Nashville commercial station suffered a power failure. Governor Ellington consulted with the South Carolina representatives, and within 5 minutes the telephone company had switched the Kennedy speech into the South Carolina ETV system. Thus, it was broadcast.

South Carolina's ETV progress has been substantially helped by forthright expressions of approval from leading educators in the State, including State Superintendent Anderson; President Robert L. Sumwalt, of the University of South Carolina; President Robert C. Edwards, of Clemson College, and others.

Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, speaking before an audience of more than 900 educators, legislators, businessmen, and farmers at the 1961 South Carolina Governors' conference on business, industry, education, and agriculture, said, "Across the Nation, South Carolina ranks first in television education."

Visitors to the State have added their accolades. Dr. Eurich has commended the closed circuit, teamwork teaching, direct instructional, and video-taped practices.

Dr. William L. Bowden, of the southern regional education board, which works closely with the southern Governors' conference, spent 2 days in Columbia studying the South Carolina program.

"You have overwhelmed me," Dr. Bowden said. "A miracle has been performed in South Carolina. My whole concept of the use of television will have to be substantially changed."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132, the educational television bill. The bill seeks to give proper launching to a new dimensional educational use that has enormous potential—far more than most of us can possibly realize. We know from past experience here in the Congress that the country has had difficulty in gearing itself to the future needs of education. Our educational processes in the United States should be our first concern, and yet it lags.

There is a shortage of classrooms, teachers are underpaid, insufficient numbers of students go on to higher education, there is too little incentive to go into the teaching profession, and there are demonstrated, severe weaknesses in language, mathematics, and the sciences.

Educational television, to the extent that it has been used in some of the States, has already proved its worth. My own State of New York, for example, is one of the chief pioneers in the field.

One reason that I argue in favor of this measure is that I am persuaded that in the absence of movement in this field,

there is grave danger that ultrahigh frequency and very high frequency channels will be lost to commercial television purposes. Commercial pressures that seek to invade these frequencies for commercial purposes are heavy. They will prove irresistible unless these frequencies can be occupied by the States and localities, through educational institutions, for nonprofit educational purposes. This is serious matter, sufficiently serious that, when coupled with the educational needs of the country, it warrants the expenditure by the U.S. Government of upward of \$25 million for matching grants to the States for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

I think it appropriate to point to the pioneering advances made in New York State in the field of educational television under the leadership of Governor Rockefeller. After an extensive period of experiment and research, the New York State Legislature, at the request of Governor Rockefeller, appropriated for educational television in the fiscal year that began April 1, 1961, \$1 million. The New York program includes:

First. Pilot experimental television projects at a cost of approximately \$600,000. The major pilot projects underway are the regents educational television project in New York City, an open broadcast experiment conducted over channel 11, under contract with WPIX, with day programs designed for use in elementary and secondary schools and made available to over 740,000 students last year; the Cortland School District pilot project, a closed-circuit experiment in which the schools of that city and certain outlying rural schools are connected by coaxial cable and talk-back features; and two smaller projects being carried out by the State university.

Second. Legislation, enacted at the request of the Governor, providing a system of State grants to local school systems for the installation and operation of educational television through open broadcast or closed-circuit facilities. An appropriation of \$200,000 has been provided in fiscal years 1961-62 for local school system educational television projects approved by the Commissioner of Education. Under this plan, the State will pay 50 percent of the cost of acquisition and installation of equipment and will pay a decreasing proportion of operating expenses over a 5-year period.

Third. New grants for noncommercial educational television councils, chartered by the regents, for the expansion of open broadcast UHF and VHF television. New York State 1961-62 appropriations provide an additional \$200,000 to aid these councils under provisions of the State education law.

Fourth. Newly allocated planning funds for the development of a statewide system of educational television, primarily at the college level. In Governor Rockefeller's special message to the legislature on higher education in 1961, he recommended that the board of regents, in cooperation with public and private institutions of higher education, develop such a plan, and \$50,000 was appropriated for this purpose.

It seems to me that this Federal program should be available to educational television facilities already constructed, such as the WPIX program in New York City. Therefore, I wish to direct a question to the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee in order to determine whether the bill contemplates that funds will be available for completed projects such as the one I have just described. Before asking the question I want to add that I am worried that we in New York will find ourselves in the same box that we were in when the Federal highway bill was passed.

New York had pioneered in this area also, but New York was later prejudiced because the Federal program was not made retroactive. In effect, the State was hurt because it had moved ahead. So I have been curious of the exact meaning of the language in this bill in respect to educational television facilities that have already been built and planning programs that have already been undertaken.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and also any Member who cares to participate for a clarification of the language appearing in section 393, paragraph (e) of the bill. That language, as I read it, provides that in any existing facility the State, or the nonprofit institution operating under the auspices of the State, may be reimbursed to the extent of 25 percent of the cost of that facility, no matter when that facility happened to have been built. Is my thinking on that correct?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. In answer to the gentleman's question, regardless of when the facilities were built, they can take advantage of the 25 percent credit feature.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Do I understand also that regardless of when the original facility may have been built, any new additions or improvements that are made will be treated exactly like a new facility insofar as the State's participation in the program is concerned? In other words, should the existing educational TV facility in New York City, under contract with WPIX, be expanded by the addition of new equipment, would the cost of that expansion be reimbursable by the Federal Government up to 50 percent?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. As I understand the provision, it would say that they could be credited for no more than 75 percent of the new facilities.

Mr. LINDSAY. The new facilities or the improvements, whichever you wish to call it, would qualify?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Yes. But under no situation would the Federal Government contribute more than \$1 million to each State.

Mr. LINDSAY. I understand. Over the period of time specified in the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. So that we can have it clear as to what the actual provision is that the gentleman from Alabama explained a moment ago, if you will refer to page 12, paragraph (e) of the bill, it provides in this paragraph what the credit is. I think it should be referred to as a "credit" rather than a "reimbursable" provision. On page 13, line 4 the bill reads:

Except that the total amount of any grant made under this section with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Commissioner to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project.

That is very clear, I take it.

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes, I understand it. The final and last question that I had goes to the question of planning money. Now, the bill provides for the allocation of a fixed sum of planning money to each State. Do I understand that this allocation would be available regardless of amounts already appropriated and/or spent by any State for planning purposes? In other words, if planning projects and programs have been completed by a State, in effect will there be a reimbursement up to \$10,000?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HARRIS. In the first place, there would not be any reimbursement. In the second place, it does not contemplate that a total of \$10,000 will be arbitrarily and automatically provided for each State. It provides up to \$10,000 if a State needs that much for a survey, then that amount can be approved. If that amount is not needed but a lesser amount, then that amount would be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question or two. I would like to direct them either to the distinguished chairman of the committee or to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ROBERTS.

Earlier, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] made reference to the equal time restriction that applies with respect to broadcasting. Section 398 of the bill, on page 17, reads:

Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize any * * * agency * * * of the United States to exercise any * * * control over educational television broadcasting.

I appreciate what the purpose of that language is but, in view of that language I wonder what remains of the equal time requirement and how it would apply to educational television broadcasting?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, section 315 has to do with political broadcasts, as the gentleman knows, and therefore primarily that would not be applicable here unless

the particular educational station would determine to permit that facility to be used for such purpose. Now, in that case, if they permit them to use the facilities for such purpose, then they would be committed and obligated to meet the present requirements of law. But, I would like to remind the gentleman that on page 11 of the bill it provides that such television broadcasting facilities will be used only for educational purposes. So, therefore, I cannot conceive of any way that they could permit these facilities to be used for such purpose.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Of course, that particular provision of the bill has reference to the application for a grant which is made by the Commissioner of Education, and at the particular time of making the application, the Commissioner of Education must be satisfied that the station will be used only for educational purposes. Now, let us assume that the Commissioner has been satisfied at that point, and then a station is constructed and goes into operation. After it is in operation, suppose the station is then used for political purposes. I assume that the FCC would not be without any regulatory power, but I want to clear up the matter.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, if the applicant, just as it is today with all licensees, proposes to use the license for a different purpose and abuses the privilege, then the Federal Communications Commission would appropriately move in.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In other words, section 398 on page 17 referring to "control of educational television" has reference to educational curriculum?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. GRIFFIN. And it does not refer to the character of the broadcasting or the basis upon which the channel was awarded. If an educational station should depart from its purpose and transmit programs which are political in nature, this section would not prevent the FCC from exercising some authority?

Mr. HARRIS. Not at all. The paragraph which the gentleman refers to has to do with the educational programs, where they originate, and how they are given and presented to the public. It has nothing to do at all with the requirement for the licensee to live up to requirements of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the chairman will permit me to go back again to the equal time provision, I wonder if the chairman of the committee could elaborate further as to whether the equal time provision will or will not apply to educational television?

Mr. HARRIS. In my judgment, the licensee would be permitted to have a license for an educational television program on the basis that such broadcasting facility would be used only for that purpose. If the licensee proceeds to use that facility for different purposes than those for which he obtained a license, obviously the Federal Communications Commission would make some inquiry and could, in my judgment, and should,

take some action. Now, should that facility go beyond its authority and permit political broadcasts, in my judgment the Federal Communications Commission in carrying out its duty insofar as the issuance of the license is concerned would require equal time and equal treatment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I appreciate that explanation by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Now, I would like to call attention at page 16, to the definition of "nonprofit community educational television organization," which, according thereto, means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and so forth. Could the gentleman say categorically that neither the U.S. Chamber of Commerce nor the AFL-CIO would be qualified for funds under that definition?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I would say that is true because there is another provision in the bill that says it must be such an institution or an organization that was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting. I cannot conceive of a situation where the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO admitted that they were organized for other purposes than most everybody knows.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, following this, so that there will be no misunderstanding about what is done in these cases, I would like to point to the university in my own community, the University of Illinois, which has a rule, passed by the board of trustees, that once a statement of candidacy is filed for any political office, that person is not eligible to appear on either TV or radio in person. That is substantially the rule as I understand it that universities follow, for the simple reason of staying out of this one particular thing. Prior to that time it is my understanding that any public official, that is, prior to the time he filed a statement of candidacy for an election to come up, may appear on the stage if it is in the nature of education or if it is in the nature of supplying information, which they want to have on such a program. Of course, that appearance, naturally, would not be political.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Of course, in that case it is a self-imposed restriction which the university has taken upon itself.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let us say they did not impose that restriction. Then they would be bound by the rules of the FCC and equal time would apply.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It is your understanding that equal time would apply? I think there is some question here, because as I understand the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], I do not believe he said

equal time would apply. He said there should be no political appearances at all.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is my understanding of the subject, and I believe I am right, this would apply to what we generally consider to release local communities from Federal control in the education bills which we have passed already.

The language here is quite simple along with other language we have had in educational fields.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to nail this down a little tighter, if we can. The gentleman referred to section 398 which says:

Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize, et cetera.

In other words, this provision is applicable only to provisions in this part. Section 315 is in another part. It covers the entire scope of broadcasting. Therefore I would say categorically that it would be applicable.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am glad to hear that and I thank the chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to be as clear as I can about this. I am fearful there might be some wrong interpretation placed on the answer I gave the gentleman a moment ago about the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO. My own judgment is that what I said was correct, but I think it is only fair to the House for me to say that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO under this language might attempt to promote some organization that would become a subsidiary or be in some way attached to it, which might be established for the sole purpose of this legislation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say that the chairman has not helped the situation at all as far as I am concerned, and perhaps points out the need for an amendment to that particular section.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, the question here is not whether or not we are going to have educational television. That answer has already been given: we are going to have it. The question is more appropriately presented whether or not we are going to once more inject the Federal Government into an area where the States should be supreme—they are operating and progressing—and the Federal purpose would ultimately be to control.

The State of Ohio has made noteworthy progress in this field. From the Summary of Educational Television in the Separate States, prepared by the Joint Council on Educational Broadcasting, May 2, 1961, the following is taken:

OHIO SUMMARY

The nine channels reserved for education in Ohio are UHF. Through the untiring efforts of the State's institutions of higher

learning, public schools, community groups, and the State legislature, four of these channels have been put into operation—at Columbus (WOSU-TV), Cincinnati (WCET), Oxford (WMUB-TV), and Toledo (WGTE-TV).

An educational television commission appointed by the Governor has embarked upon plans to develop a statewide network; \$60,000 was initially provided by the legislature for this purpose.

Our detailed report describes the wealth of programming which is originated by the operating stations. While the emphasis is upon lessons for inschool audiences and formal courses for adults, the range of informal, informative programming is constantly being broadened and reaches ever-increasing audiences.

Leading educators from Ohio have presented formal testimony in Washington vigorously supporting the proposed ETV legislation.

LEGISLATURE

Year 1953: The legislature instructed the legislative service commission to study educational television.

Year 1955: On recommendation of that study, the legislature enacted a measure permitting boards of education to make contributions to educational television foundations for programs to be shown in schools.

Year 1959: The legislature created an Interim Educational TV Study Commission and appropriated \$60,000 for its use during a 2-year period.

The study commission explored with other State agencies the feasibility of developing a statewide network of interconnected stations.

Year 1961: The study commission submitted its report to the legislature in February 1961. It recommended the creation of a nine-member Educational Television Network Commission composed of the State superintendent of public instruction and representatives from State universities and public schools. The proposed State plan envisioned an eventual 29 station UHF network across the State, with the first phase to be the construction of ETV stations for Akron-Kent, Athens, Bowling Green, Cleveland and Dayton-Zenita. Cost estimates based on an engineering study were included.

In March, bills were introduced to create the ETV Network Commission and appropriate administrative funds, and to authorize the ETV Commission to proceed with the actual establishment of the network as funds are made available.

UNIVERSITIES

ETV station WOSU-TV, Columbus, channel 34, began broadcasting programs on February 20, 1956, and was the second ETV station in Ohio to go on the air. It was established by Ohio State University.

WOSU-TV broadcasts 72 hours a week with a variety of programs for all ages, including NET programs. Inschool programming includes two French series, science for second, sixth, and ninth grades; two college credit courses; and two programs for pre-school children.

The programs for elementary and secondary schools are produced in cooperation with the Columbus schools and are used in five counties in central Ohio (40,000 students).

Of special interest is a third college course, mathematics 400, which is received on campuses at Columbus, Newark, Mansfield and Marion. In connection with this telecourse, evaluations are being made as to the effectiveness of supplementing TV instruction by varying amounts and kinds of non-TV instruction.

Evaluation is also underway of several ways of using TV in teaching a course in personal health required of all students at Ohio State University. About 2,000 students

are taking the course. TV sections of 320 are followed by small group discussions in the third phase of the project (spring 1961).

The university has several closed circuit TV systems, including one used to teach dentistry and one for classroom observation by teacher trainees and for occasional demonstrations in a number of subjects.

The university is cooperating in the Midwest project on Airborne Instructional Television.

ETV station WMUB-TV, Oxford, Channel 14, began broadcasting programs on October 13, 1959. The station is licensed to Miami University, Oxford.

In February 1956, Miami University began to use closed circuit TV to teach three college courses to about 500 students in each course. These courses are now broadcast in late morning hours.

Other morning programs include series for preschool children and news and general interest programming for the home. The station is on the air three evenings a week with general cultural programming, some produced by the university and some provided by NET.

Ohio University, Athens, has a closed circuit TV system and is planning to construct an ETV station. In February 1961, the university petitioned the FCC to reassign channel 20 to Athens and reserve it for education. In April, the FCC issued proposed rule-making looking toward the addition of this channel at Athens.

Other colleges and universities having closed circuit TV systems are the Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland; Marietta College, Marietta, the University of Akron, and the University of Dayton.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The ETV activities of the Columbus schools have been mentioned under universities, and the Cincinnati and Dayton school ETV activities are discussed below under community groups.

The Zanesville Board of Education has presented a high school biology program on Saturday mornings on a commercial TV station, which also carries some programs from ETV station WOSU-TV, Columbus.

The Newark, Ohio, public schools are planning to construct an ETV station and petitioned the FCC in October 1960 to reassign channel 28 to Newark and reserve it for education; the FCC has made the channel available for Newark ETV use.

South High School and Linmoor Junior High in Columbus have closed-circuit TV systems. At South High the students raised \$6,000 to begin their closed-circuit system by devoting to that purpose the proceeds from the noon movies shown during the lunch hour.

COMMUNITY GROUPS

ETV station WCET, Cincinnati, channel 48, began broadcasting programs on July 26, 1954. Ohio's first ETV station, it was established by the Greater Cincinnati Television Educational Foundation.

Voting members of the foundation are 38 accredited educational institutions in Ohio and Kentucky, including 7 colleges or universities, 17 county or city boards of education in Ohio and 11 in Kentucky, 2 systems of parochial schools, and the public library of Cincinnati.

WCET is on the air 49 hours a week with NET programs for home and school and locally produced series. Inschool programming includes something for every grade from kindergarten through 12th, and two methods courses for teachers. Three years of French are offered for elementary students immediately after school certain days of the week; the teaching methods are carried after school on other days. The high school biology course is four times a week and is repeated at another hour.

Programs for the home are carried from 7 to 10 p.m. The general cultural program-

ing of WCET is attracting an ever-increasing home audience. TV servicemen report a recent rush of order for converters, one stating that he has sold out and another that he is weeks behind with his installations.

ETV station WGTE-TV, Toledo, channel 30, began broadcasting programs on October 10, 1960, and is Ohio's newest ETV station. The licensee is the Greater Toledo Educational Television Foundation.

The member institutions of the foundation are eight public school systems, the parochial schools of the diocese, the Toledo Museum of Art, the public library, a private school, the Mary Manse College, and the University of Toledo.

The Miami Valley ETV Foundation, in the Dayton area, has produced science programs for grades 6 to 8 on a commercial TV station in Dayton, in cooperation with a local newspaper. The Miami Valley group is currently working toward establishing an ETV station on channel 16, reserved for Dayton.

The Greater Cleveland Television Educational Association was incorporated in 1958 as an outcome of the ETV activities of the Adult Education Association and other groups.

The association is working to obtain financial support to construct an ETV station on reserved channel 25. It has secured a rental option on a former broadcasting property, is making an engineering study of available transmitter sites, and has the cooperation of three major school systems.

The Ohio Council on Educational Television is a statewide organization of educators and interested citizens that has been working toward the expansion of ETV service in the State. The council has voted to support the recommendations of the Interim ETV study commission (described under legislature) for a State network of ETV stations.

In the months which have intervened since that report, further progress has been made. A State-by-State summary of activity indicates no pressing need for Federal trespass into this field.

In reading the hearings on this bill, it is significant to note that the National Education Association apparently avoided speaking out for or against this measure. In fact, no major educational organization has promoted this measure.

It is certainly conceivable that organizations other than academic could qualify under this bill. Under definitions on page 16 of the bill, the following appears:

(6) The term "nonprofit" as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

It certainly is conceivable that the State educational television agency could approve nonprofit organizations other than academic. Without adequate safeguards, the chamber of commerce could qualify as a nonprofit community educational television organization as could the AFL-CIO. COPE now calls itself educational and qualifies as nonprofit.

ETV is already "the fastest growing mass media means of communications"—without Federal financing of ETV stations and facilities.

"If ETV does help solve the educational problem, if it enables the available teachers to give higher quality instruction to more students, then ETV should prove itself in and be able largely

to pay its own way," according to Caldwell Buck, staff engineer in the Business Relations Department, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

ETV has opened the door to savings in school budgets. These savings can be used, among other things, to finance costs of ETV directly from present school budgets.

A survey at Penn State of four courses showed that "the cost per student-semester-hour was only \$5.44 for televised instruction, compared with \$9.48 for conventional methods." A study by the Southern Regional Education Board—covering some 300 colleges and universities in 16 States—showed that the cost of televised instruction would run about \$2.80 per student-semester-hour, compared with the present cost of \$12 to \$18 for conventional instruction.

At Hagerstown, Md., 4 teachers now provide music and art lessons that would have required 34 teachers before television. In Dade County, Fla., the use of cafeterias and auditoriums for large TV classes has permitted 30 percent more pupils to use each school building, saving \$3 million in capital construction costs alone.

Dr. Alexander J. Stoddard visited 72 communities throughout the United States for the fund for the advancement of education and set forth savings he could foresee—"approximately \$500 million in teachers' salaries alone."

Last year at its national convention, members of the National School Boards Association expressed their opposition to Federal financing of ETV by rejecting a resolution that "the organization go on record in favor of Federal support for State surveys of educational television and for the construction of educational television facilities."

No need has been established today, nor was need established in 1959 when the Senate considered S. 12, an ETV bill. Former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming expressed his opposition to S. 12 in a letter to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON:

We have no information indicating that a Federal program, such as this bill would provide, is necessary to assure continuing development of educational television, or that there is an inability to finance the acquisition and installation of transmitting equipment.

Because no need is apparent, because other means of financing is available and being used, and because ETV is "the fastest growing mass media means of communication"—without direct Federal aid, I ask your support in rejecting this unnecessary additional burden to an already strained Federal budget.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to clarify a point which my colleague from Illinois made. If a candidate for public office is foreclosed from appearing on an educational television program once he has filed or announced his candidacy, what would be the situation in the case of a staff announcer who decided to run for public office and announced his candidacy? Would he then have to give up his posi-

tion with the educational television station?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would say this, that so far as the University of Illinois is concerned it is my understanding that once a statement of candidacy has been filed, whether the person is an incumbent or not, he may not appear on that station in any capacity.

Mr. COLLIER. I think this is not too farfetched a matter, because one can obviously see that a person who had access to this tremendous exposure through the medium of an educational television station could very easily find it within his heart if he had any political ambitions to become a candidate for public office and through that means, of course, use this tool to enhance his position as a political candidate.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say in this particular instance, the rule is that of the university. We do have at least two Members of the House who in the past have been announcers on radio stations, I understand, and I do not know what the rule was when they became candidates.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the gentleman from Illinois has raised a question that is rather pertinent. I think I can be helpful in informing the Members of the House as to section 315. For example, in the last campaign there was an announcer who had been working for a particular broadcasting company for many years, for 18 or 20 years, perhaps, in any event a long period of time. He decided to run for the State senate in his particular State. After he announced his intention and qualified as a candidate, he continued as a news announcer on the regular daily programs. That matter was brought to the attention of the Federal Communications Commission by his opponent.

The Commission held that since he became a candidate, the opposing candidate was entitled to equal time and therefore required the station to make available to him the time that had been consumed by this newscaster who had done his job on a daily basis of newscasting since that time.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I think the equal-time provision really goes beyond the political field. For instance, should one of these stations, like any other station, broadcast on a controversial subject that is not political, they would still have to give equal time. We have a case now, the Newburgh case, which was used as a news program of the NBC and the people of Newburgh have asked for equal time, and my information is that they have that right.

Also, the stations now are beginning to do quite a bit of editorializing and I have raised that point. I find wherever they editorialize on a very controversial subject, they must give equal time to the other side of the controversy.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct. Section 315 that we have been referring to does apply to certain instances which the gentleman has brought up, but it does not require equal time. The language with reference to this particular problem that the gentleman raises provides that the stations shall "afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance." There is that difference.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is, they shall afford time on the other side. They may not have exactly the same time, but they must afford the opposition time.

Mr. HARRIS. The station must afford a reasonable opportunity.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 132, the bill which provides for educational television. This bill offers a most important opportunity in the development of educational television in the United States. Practically all of the testimony before the extensive hearings of the congressional committees has favored passage of this legislation. The members of the Joint Council on Educational Broadcasting (JCEB) and the council as a whole have consistently supported the legislation. Support has also come from many national and local leaders representing the interests of government, education, industry, and labor.

President Kennedy said on this subject "since education is a matter of national concern, the Federal Government should assist in expediting the use of television as a tested aid to education in the schools and colleges of the Nation, and as a means of meeting the needs of adult educators."

The bill at least accelerates the establishment of additional educational television stations by assisting the several States in the development of State programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, and by aiding government and private nonprofit agencies concerned with educational television through Federal matching grants in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132. I feel it is a step in the right direction. I want to compliment the members of the committee, and particularly the members of the subcommittee for reporting this legislation, and to thank them for coming

to the city and county of Denver more than 3 years ago to inspect the educational television station that has been operated by school district No. 1, in the city and county of Denver.

The experience resulting from the operation by the school district shows the need of educational television. I am hopeful that when this legislation is adopted it can be extended and used not only in the city and county of Denver, but also throughout the State of Colorado. At the present time the school district has established a large facility which is supported by school district No. 1.

I would like to ask a few questions of the chairman of the committee or of the subcommittee about a situation that may develop. Under the grants, Mr. Chairman, directing attention to subsection 392 which provides for a matching grant for service to be made by the State and the Federal Government where educational television is now in existence, is it possible for the State through the operations as outlined in the bill to make an application and receive a grant for a further expansion of that particular educational television facility?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. It would.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It would permit the State to make proper application and receive grants thereunder.

The other question is this: The school district having established a television station, as we have in the city and county of Denver, upon application by the school district to the Federal Government, is it possible to get reimbursement to school district No. 1 for that portion of construction they have already spent? That is to say we have spent several hundred thousand dollars in the construction of this station and we may want to expand it. Can we now make application and get, say, 25 percent of that back as provided in section 393(e)?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. As I said earlier in the afternoon it would be a credit; it would not be reimbursable, but on any expansion it could receive a credit.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then the only opportunity a station now in existence has to obtain any money under this provision would be by an expansion of its facilities.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we of the City of Pittsburgh know how valuable educational television can be.

The first community supported educational television station in the United States is located in the congressional

district which I have the honor to represent here in Congress.

On April 1, 1954, WQED, channel 13, began telecasting as the world's first community sponsored educational television station.

Today, WQED, with VHF channel 13, and UHF channel 16 has an audience of over 1 million viewers in 10 western Pennsylvania counties.

At the end of the first semester of this school year, there were 2,715 public school and private school classrooms viewing basic school courses, such as fifth and sixth grade science, seventh and eighth grade developmental reading, physical sciences, world cultures, physics, French, and Spanish. In supplemental course participation there were 5,491 classrooms watching such subjects as current events, dance, music, Pennsylvania history, science, and speech improvement. WQED's enrollment for instruction extends now to more than 8,000 classrooms in 103 school districts, reaching 250,000 schoolchildren.

This development of educational television did not come about overnight. Many years of development work by the Pittsburgh Council of Parents and Teachers, charitable foundations, civic groups and commercial broadcasting companies, other business groups and then Mayor of Pittsburgh David L. Lawrence were required before WQED went on the air in 1954.

In the fall of 1955, WQED began "a world's first"—basic instructions through television for elementary school children. Fifth grade reading, arithmetic and French were taught in the 16 participating schools which included 20 classrooms. In 1956, television teaching expanded to high school physics and fifth grade history-geography. The number of participating schools increased to 34 with 39 regularly enrolled classrooms.

WQED inaugurated the "Adults School of the Air" to enable adults to earn their high school diplomas. During the first year, a total of 834 students enrolled in the courses. In the first graduating class were 11 prisoners in the Western Pennsylvania Penitentiary and the Allegheny County Workhouse.

For several years, WQED has conducted a "Summer School of the Air" which has served the community by offering makeup courses for academic failures at the high school level.

The allocation of a second channel—channel 16—UHF—made Pittsburgh one of the few cities in the United States with two educational television channels. This special-purpose channel is used for instructional and professional as well as management and industrial training. Channel 16, which began broadcasting in March 1959 has brought a new concept of training to business, industry, and labor. This may become one of our greatest assets in the job of retraining industrial workers in this time of rapid technological changes.

A few highlights from the WQED program schedule this year will suffice to show the cultural contributions that educational television can make to a community. WQED in January broad-

cast an art series from the Boston Museum of Fine Arts entitled "Invitation to Art"; a 15-week series of Shakespearean plays titled "An Age of Kings," which depicts more than 100 years of British history; "Intertel"; "Prospects of Mankind" with Eleanor Roosevelt; "Jazz Scene"; a homeviewer question-and-answer program, "Call Your Doctor"; "Open End" with David Susskind; "Play of the Week"; Boston Symphony Orchestra series; "Heritage" series, as well as informative series on law, music, travel, and roundtable controversies.

The school services division of WQED brings to the classroom the best of skills in teaching and the best of current practices in curriculum combined with the impact of the television techniques.

The philosophy of the school services division is to augment the effectiveness of classroom teaching by the advantages of television teaching. The television lesson is only part of every classroom teaching situation. The television teacher is responsible for extending, enriching, and bringing adequate visual aid to the lesson, plus the basic instruction in basic courses. The classroom teacher is responsible for continuing the teaching and meeting the individual needs of the class.

We have found that parents have followed the education of their children by watching their children's classes at home; students out of school because of illness have been able to continue their regular classes on television. Finally, for the classroom teacher, television instruction offers the opportunity to watch a colleague develop and teach a basic course and is, therefore, an excellent source of inservice education.

Of the 64 hours of television programming Monday through Friday at WQED, 36 of these hours are devoted to instructional programming for classroom use. Highlights for the present semester—1962-63—are: students who participated in beginning Spanish can continue in intermediate Spanish; world cultures is telecast three times weekly in the morning and afternoon for easier classroom scheduling; another three-credit college course, literature for today, is presented for inservice teacher training; two new elementary courses are offered: Primary concepts in science and primary concepts in mathematics.

Concerts for young people, planned for appreciation and understanding of the Pittsburgh Youth Symphony concerts are part of the school services programs of "Music for Young People."

Mr. Chairman, through the operation of WQED, we in Pittsburgh have found educational television to be an invaluable adjunct to education. We have made high caliber teaching skills available to many more students than would otherwise have been possible. We have been able to offer such courses as Spanish to students who would otherwise be unable to learn the language. In short, Mr. Chairman, WQED has broadened and strengthened our educational program at a time when the importance of education cannot be overstated.

But this is just the beginning. From a lone pioneer in educational television,

WQED has now joined a family of 62 national educational stations. These stations should now join in a fourth national television network so as to be able to show a single program simultaneously in the major cities of the United States. The savings in money and the increase in talent which we have demonstrated in Pittsburgh could be multiplied 62 times. It will cost money to achieve these savings and these improvements in our education.

Under H.R. 132 the Federal Government will share in bringing this new dimension in education to our children. Mr. Chairman, I urge the enactment of H.R. 132.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132, legislation that would create a Federal-State cooperative matching fund program to encourage educational television. This bill will launch our country generally upon the path of bringing into our educational system the great advantage and opportunity afforded by the television medium. My interest in the development of educational television extends back to 1949 when as a New York State senator I sponsored the first legislation for support of State educational television in New York State. New York State has been a leader in the field of educational television. In New York City we have the National Educational Television and Radio Center and through its efforts the Metropolitan New York area has obtained Channel 13 which will provide full-scale educational television service for our great metropolitan area. Our New York experience, however, highlights the need for Federal and State assistance to communities in the establishment of educational television. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that television has the capability to expand a massive upgrading in the quality of American education for a cost which we can easily afford, a cost in fact which we cannot afford not to pay. This bill will achieve that objective.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 132, a bill which would amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

The pending legislation would assist the States, through a program of Federal matching grants, in surveying the need and developing programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, as well as in constructing such facilities. H.R. 132 would authorize Federal grants, not to exceed \$520,000 for the next 3 fiscal years, for the development of State surveys and programs for constructing educational television broadcasting facilities; and an additional grant, not to exceed \$25 million for the next 4 fiscal years, for the construction of these facilities. The total amount for construction of facilities within any one State would be limited to \$1 million.

Similar legislation, providing Federal assistance for educational television, has been before the Congress for several years. Let me attempt to point out the urgent need for final action on this measure.

In 1952 the Federal Communications Commission set aside television channels for the exclusive use of educational television broadcasting—to date over 270 have been reserved for noncommercial educational stations. There are at present, however, only 62 educational television stations on the air. Although the Commission has expressed its desire to cooperate with programs which assist the development of educational television, the demand to use these channels for commercial television purposes is great. Unless the process of getting educational television stations on the air is speeded up, these reserved channels may be lost to education.

One of the major problems in the development of educational television lies not in the lack of interest, desire, and planning among our States, local communities or educators. The distinguished chairman on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. HARRIS, sent letters to the Governors of all the States last year to determine whether the States were ready to join with the Federal Government in a cooperative program of promoting construction of educational television facilities. The response was overwhelmingly in favor of a cooperative Federal-State program in the field of educational television. The drawback, however, lies in the lack of funds available.

In his statement before the subcommittee holding hearings on educational TV last year, William G. Harley, president of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, reported that 45 States had actively participated in and supported the development of educational television; and 25 States had formed State educational television commissions by direction of their respective legislatures. Interest is widespread, then, in this new educational medium. Mr. Harley pointed out, however, that despite this fine record of progress "further development is now largely dependent on Federal assistance, and in many instances a prolonged delay would seriously retard program development and cooperative school utilization." In my own State of New York planning and activity since 1952 have resulted in an ETV station at Buffalo, three additional stations in the formative stage, and several large closed-circuit operations and production centers. New York and several other States, however, have now reached a critical point in their ETV development and without some assistance no effective progress can be made.

This Congress cannot neglect to consider favorably H.R. 132 which would serve to ease major problems in our education crisis.

Existing ETV programs give strong evidence of the advantages in the use of television as an effective tool in the educational process. Not only can it ease the teacher shortage, but it also extends the influence of superior teachers far beyond the reach of their own classrooms. Fifth graders in Pittsburgh, for example, heard and saw Robert Frost read some of his poems not long ago. Highly skilled teachers of mathematics, chemistry, and foreign languages are

available to a wider range of students than is possible in the conventional classroom. And students are offered front row seats for involved science experiments and demonstrations which many schools do not offer and cannot afford.

The opportunities which educational television offer to the rural or less populous areas of our Nation cannot be overlooked. An expanded program of ETV would bring to these students the benefits of a diversified curriculum which in many cases is now economically impossible.

How does the student benefit from ETV? Studies have shown that the student accepts more responsibility for his own learning than is the case with conventional methods of instruction. In a report of the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Advancement of Education it was revealed that students in television classes at the elementary and secondary level make more extensive use of the school library than students in regular classes. Television instruction also allows the student to progress at his own individual rate. This is of paramount significance in our efforts to fully develop the potentials of our young people. John Burns, president of RCA, stated the case aptly before the Senate committee last year:

With television, language laboratories, and other electronic aids, each student can move ahead at a tempo best suited to his own development. The fast learner in a particular subject can be exposed to televised lectures that challenge him to his full capacity. The average learner can be encouraged to develop the particular gifts he possesses. The slow learner can be assured of the kind of attention that will prevent his falling hopelessly behind.

Television then can help bring to every student higher quality education.

But what will be the cost of an expanded ETV program. We are currently spending more than \$300 per public school pupil. With increasing school enrollments and present instructional methods that figure will continue to rise. An expanded ETV program, however, can reduce the overall cost. A survey of four courses at Penn State showed that the cost per student-semester-hour was \$9.48 for conventional methods, and \$5.44 for televised instruction. And the Southern Regional Education Board in a survey of some 300 colleges and universities in 16 States reported that the present per student-semester-hour cost was \$12 to \$18 for conventional instruction and estimated at \$2.80 for televised instruction. Testimony before the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power showed that savings in capital outlay for classrooms had amounted to \$3 million in Miami and potential savings over the next 5 years at an estimated \$12 million.

With these facts before the Congress, it seems imperative that we no longer delay in assisting the States in providing better educational broadcasting facilities.

President Kennedy in his education message last year said:

Our twin goals must be a new standard of excellence in education—and the availability

of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

Television, described as the most important new educational tool since the invention of movable type, offers great possibilities in increasing the excellence of our education and in broadening and enriching the learning process of American students. I urge passage of H.R. 132.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes.

I have long been interested in the basic principles incorporated in this bill which have today been accepted by and large for the planning and use of television in education. In the first session of this Congress, I introduced H.R. 5536, a bill which is similar to H.R. 132. The purpose of these bills is to speed up the establishment of additional educational television broadcasting facilities by aiding governmental and private nonprofit agencies concerned with educational television with Federal matching grants.

One hundred years ago, America's educational goals found expression in the Morrill Act which established the land-grant colleges throughout the United States. The fundamental significance of the Morrill Act was that for the first time our colleges were brought to the people. Teaching and research were not limited to the confines of campuses. The Morrill Act was described in the report of a National Manpower Council as "the most important single Government step in the training of scientific and professional personnel."

While significant strides have been made since 1862 in all levels of our educational systems, one problem in U.S. education is paramount. As of this moment, there are more students to be educated than we are prepared to handle effectively by current techniques of teaching and administration. It is clear that our standards of education must be raised and greatly improved. Both the procedures and the facilities of education must be reevaluated in the light of current and future demands. Almost 50 million persons are receiving some type of schooling in the United States today. Public elementary and secondary schools alone are carrying a load of more than 36 million enrolled pupils. An additional 6 million youngsters are in independent and church-related schools. By 1965, it is estimated that public school enrollment will top 41 million while the national population grows to more than 190 million. Hence, the pressure of sheer numbers will get greater in the years ahead.

One of the constants of our changing world is the passage of time—the moving hour hand of the clock. Student enrollments, teacher shortages, facilities are the inconstants, the invariables, as are the interrelationships of these three elements—teacher-student ratios, group sizes and the spaces for school learning and living activities.

Aside from the curricular requirements in the years ahead, it is necessary that thought be given to the redeployment of our students and teaching skills so that more effective advantages can be gained. Extension of the skills of our teachers to move students, greater use of existing and planned school buildings, enrichment of curricular offerings all demand increased use of audiovisual aids.

Of the audiovisual aids currently available, television appears to offer the greatest potential in the broadest areas. It has been said that for education, television is one of the most significant technological developments since the invention of printing. Although still in its infancy, television already has made a significant impact upon the collective mind of our society. While there is evidence that television has experienced erosion from a stream of mediocrity and abuse in commercial use, this in no way, however, impugns the potential value of television used properly and intelligently as an educational tool.

Television has no magic—it is not a self-contained educational entity; rather, it is simply another medium of communication, like a book or a human voice. Communication commences with intelligible transmission and ends with intelligent reception. Any medium of communication is but a middle link between two or more minds. The medium may be the gesture of a hand, sound waves from a human larynx, ink impressions from movable type arranged on the pages of a book, radio waves transmitted and gathered into a receiver, or electronic emanations and receptions involving television equipment.

Television does not modify the recognized goals of education; nor does it replace the classroom, even as the advent of the printed book did not mean the elimination of the teacher. Rather, it suggests alternative and possibly better techniques for reaching the same goals. Alert educators have always experimented with and learned to use new teaching methods and devices. There are numerous examples of existing practices which aim to increase reading speed and comprehension, to provide easier comprehension of the basic principles of mathematics and science, and to develop techniques for expanding our ability to communicate multilingually.

The past decade has seen the first serious experiments with the use of television as a "middle link" in our educational communication between teacher and student. After a few scattered starts in schools and colleges across the United States in 1953, the television experiments began to spread until, at the beginning of the 1960's, almost 600 school districts across the Nation are now making regular use of televised instruction; 117 colleges and universities are offering credit for television courses; 144 closed circuit television systems are operating in educational institutions and another 21 for the military, and 45 educational television—noncommercial—stations are in operation.

There is broad support in Delaware for educational television. This support

stems from the interest and efforts of the Delaware Educational Television Association, Inc., which represents about 50 major organizations throughout the State of Delaware. These groups include the Delaware State Education Association, the Catholic Diocese of Wilmington, the American Association of University Women, the Delaware Congress of Parents and Teachers, and other organizations including an advisory council representing business and industry. Leading educators and churchmen in Delaware have recognized that television is a versatile, dynamic medium and that its use in education can provide new and better ways of relating the activities of pupils, teachers, and parents and making the community more aware of educational processes and needs. They are hopeful that this legislation will be adopted. Typical of this community interest is reflected in a letter I received recently from the Reverend Philip H. Dunning, director, Department of Christian Education, Council of Churches, Wilmington and New Castle County, Del.

Reverend Dunning writes:

May I call to your attention, and I am sure you are already familiar with, the bill which has been introduced in the House to provide \$51 million in Federal grants to States to help set up television stations for school broadcasts.

We would appreciate it very much if you could continue to lend your strong support to any measure which will help aid the cause of educational TV in our State, as well as throughout the country.

Many thanks to you for your help in the past and for your continued help in the future. There are many of us in Delaware who are sincerely and wholeheartedly hoping for the day when WHYI will be able to broadcast on channel 12.

In the capacity as president of the Delaware Educational Television Association, Inc., Reverend Dunning addressed, under date of February 15, 1962, a letter to each member of the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives urging favorable action as to H.R. 132.

The text of Reverend Dunning's letter follows:

We are writing to you in the interest of action on H.R. 132.

The Delaware Educational Television Association has studied the various bills before the Congress relating to this medium and are convinced that H.R. 132 is of immediate import. We also like the bill (H.R. 5536) introduced by our Delaware Representative, Mr. HARRIS McDOWELL, but understand that he accedes to Mr. ROBERTS' bill. We feel that H.R. 132 establishes an orderly procedure for careful utilization of the funds.

We agree with the committee report as submitted by Mr. MOULDER. He certainly speaks of us when he says that the scarcity of educational stations on the air is an indication not of a lack of interest but rather a lack of funds. We especially agree with this report that, "There is grave danger that unless the process of getting educational stations on the air is speeded up . . . these channels . . . will be irretrievably lost to education."

The passage of H.R. 132 will not only help education to meet a serious crisis; it will help a discerning minority group to see cultural and educational programs at a time that is convenient to them.

We respectfully request that the Rules Committee report H.R. 132 out for action as soon as possible.

On March 6, 1962, I received the following telegram from Mrs. Bert F. Norling, president of the Delaware division of the American Association of University Women:

The Delaware division of the American Association of University Women reaffirms its support of educational television by urging passage of bill H.R. 132. We appreciate your active interest in making available to all children and adults the broad educational and cultural opportunities presented through educational television.

This telegram also had the endorsement of Mrs. Kenneth C. Bass, Jr., chairman of the legislative program committee, and Mrs. Alfred C. Haven, Jr., chairman of the mass media committee of the Delaware division of the American Association of University Women.

In his inaugural message, Gov. Elbert N. Carvel, of the State of Delaware, on January 17, 1961, said:

During recent years, Delaware has not had the advantage of a television station located within the borders of the State providing programs of local interest. There has been much discussion about channel 12. Over 5 years ago this band was assigned to a Delaware based station which sponsored numerous programs of local interest. This helped to bring the people of our State closer together.

Unfortunately, the three major networks have TV stations near Philadelphia and apparently all believe it unprofitable to operate a duplicate facility in nearby Delaware. This does give us an opportunity to cooperate with our neighbors to the north and utilize channel 12 as an educational TV station. Such a station will provide outstanding education programs, which will be most helpful to our educational system; cultural programs for the benefit of all the people of the State; and features of State and local interest which will keep our citizens better informed about local and State industry, organizations and government. In addition, we will have the opportunity of becoming better acquainted with our local and State leaders.

Present knowledge and experience in using television as an educational medium indicates that television can become a basic educational tool for every educator, every pupil and every serious-minded adult in the United States. Wisely used, it can be as important in promoting learning as is the printed word. Educational television and the printed word are not mutually exclusive—they are complementary. I am confident that television can help bring about the best teaching of more pupils in an effective manner and at a reasonable cost. If television can alleviate school population pressures, make our best teachers available to more learners, save dollars in conventional school plant costs, make the process of learning more effective and satisfying, and provide a wider range of experiences than hitherto possible—and I have good reason to believe that when wisely used it will do all these things—then certainly it is incumbent upon all educators to move as rapidly as possible in their own planning and through their local boards of control and State legislatures to secure the bene-

fits of this dynamic medium of communication. Certainly, the House must help make this possible by enacting H.R. 132.

The impact of television on Americans and foreign correspondents and observers—young and old alike, was clearly demonstrated by the recent orbital flight in space by Lt. Col. John Glenn. To the millions of Americans who followed the preparations, the successful launching, the orbital flight, and the recovery of Colonel Glenn and space capsule *Friendship 7*, the medium of television was able to provide both visual and audio observations of a significant achievement—an achievement which drew on the mature talents of our scientists and technicians. On February 20, 1962, and in previous suborbital flights by U.S. astronauts, many Americans were provided the unique opportunity to acquaint themselves with and to learn about the complexities of space exploration, rocket propulsion, and other important facets of our modern technology.

While the transmission of educational courses such as mathematics or foreign languages may not be as spectacular as our efforts in space exploration, the ability to communicate through TV at the educational level can create and promote the human talent and skills that are essential to the United States in sustaining and enlarging its position of leadership among nations.

It cannot be denied that all levels of government will have to make heavy expenditures and our citizens will have to make greater sacrifices to meet the educational challenges in the years ahead. But I feel inclined to believe these expenditures are more of an investment—an investment in our children and adults who are, in the long run, America's most valuable resources. Such an investment will not lead to fiscal bankruptcy but the danger in failing to make such an investment can lead to a more serious disaster for our country.

In appreciation of the values of television as an educational medium and as an important intermediate link in the total act of educational communication, I fully support the objectives and programs which H.R. 132 seeks to establish, and I intend to vote for the passage of this important legislation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I hope and believe the great majority of the Members here, if not all, will promptly approve this measure—H.R. 132—before us, which provides for the establishment of a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

It clearly appears, from the testimony revealed, that some 200 of the Nation's television channels reserved for educational use have not been activated primarily because of a lack of funds for construction of television transmission facilities.

At this time, particularly, when education in this country faces serious challenges, when the need is imperative for additional physical facilities and teachers for proper instruction of the

increasing numbers of students, when subjects must be taught which only relatively few instructors are qualified and prepared to teach adequately, it seems unthinkable that this great promising medium of instruction through television should not be fully utilized as a modern and progressive teaching instrument.

We have, further, the authoritative convictions of the most highly regarded experts in this field that instruction by educational television promises to be greatly superior to conventional methods of classroom teaching in a number of subjects, particularly in science studies involving technical demonstrations for better understanding.

This bill is modeled after the Hill-Burton Act which has proven so successful in stimulating, with the aid of Federal matching grants, the construction of hospital facilities throughout the country.

This projection of instruction through television is completely in line with the recommendations of the President on this subject and there can be no doubt whatsoever that the expanded educational and cultural development objectives inherent in this legislative proposal would be in the national interest. I most earnestly urge the adoption of this measure.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, in connection with today's consideration of H.R. 132 by this House, to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes, I should like to include in the Record an important survey of transmission and use of so-called ETV that was sponsored by the ETV stations comprising the Florida Educational Television Network.

There are five such stations in Florida, located as follows: Channel 2—WTHS—in Miami, owned and operated by the Dade County Board of Public Instruction; channel 3—WEDU—in Tampa-St. Petersburg, with studios in both cities, owned and operated by Florida West Coast Educational Television, Inc., a nonprofit civic and educational corporation on whose board of directors are representatives of seven county school systems; channel 5—WUFT—in Gainesville, owned and operated by the State board of control and the University of Florida; channel 7—WJCT—in Jacksonville, owned and operated by Educational Television, Inc., a nonprofit civic and educational corporation, and the Duval County School Board; and channel 11—WFSU-TV—in Tallahassee, owned jointly by the State board of control, the Florida Educational Television Commission, and Florida State University, which operates it.

Channel 2 began operating in August 1955, and the others have been in operation for periods ranging from nearly 3 years to nearly 4 years. The general consensus of opinion is that all five have met with a good deal of success.

During the past year, a total of 5,702 classrooms—including 326 large ones—in 880 schools have been the recipients of ETV instruction. Involved have been 286,221 students, and this coverage has averaged 90.5 hours weekly. Of the 90.5

hours, roughly one-quarter has been allocated each to elementary, junior high school, senior high school, and college buildings.

The 23-hour telecast for elementary school students predominantly covered courses in social studies, Spanish, science and American history. The 19.5 hours telecast for junior high school students concentrated primarily on science and mathematics. Senior high school student coverage was mainly in English and biology, while the nearly 25 hours allocated for college students was split up among a variety of subjects, with particular emphasis on humanities, mathematics, biology, English, and the like.

All the above courses were offered for credit purposes. In addition several hours covering noncredit courses were available, mostly in the adult-education field and covering such diverse subjects as sewing, languages, shorthand, typing, writing, and the like. The estimated viewing audience in this noncredit field was 71,500 which, when added to the 286-221 viewers in courses for credit, means that 357,721 Floridians are gaining an education through the medium of television.

The really important thing about ETV, aside from its obvious value in purely instructional procedures, is its importance as a substitute for additional classroom outlays and needs. During the years since World War II, and even before, the taxpayers have been faced with an unrelenting and immediate need for additional classroom space. And, seemingly, as the need increases, so does the cost.

As an illustration, the experience of Dade County, Florida's largest, is of interest. Dade, which includes Miami, has resorted to an extended schoolday which, when incorporated with educational TV, provides the opportunity to telecast a variety of instruction to "staggered scheduled" classes at the height of the schoolday. More refined, it involves concentrating the instruction of certain classes in certain buildings on certain subjects at given hours.

For instance, under the extended schoolday or "staggered attendance" setup, seniors and ninth graders are due at school at a certain time, with juniors and eighth graders due at another time, and so forth, and with the same classes leaving the buildings at varying hours. Thus, when up to 600 students in junior high schools, for instance, are receiving telecast instruction in the auditoriums, the several senior high classroom teachers in teaching auditoriums in other schools can be reviewing previous lessons, making assignments, answering questions and preparing for the new lesson.

According to the assistant superintendent of public instruction for Dade County, "the 600 students we have assigned to the auditorium for television instruction opens up additional rooms for the 600 students enrolled beyond normal capacity."

This official, Mr. Wesley Matthews, has said that the extended day has sharply cut the amount of building necessary at the senior high and junior high level

and has permitted more building at the elementary level, where large class instruction is less predominant. He has estimated that it costs \$900 per student for construction.

He has also stated that when the capacity of a school is increased by 600 students by extending the day and through the use of TV lessons, "we have eliminated the need for 20 additional rooms at that school and have side-tracked a \$540,000 addition to the school."

This same official estimates that the extended day and educational television have held back more than \$10 million in building needs in the county.

Mr. Chairman, if further argument in behalf of the need for an expanded ETV program is needed, I can cite some excerpts from a Reader's Digest article entitled "They Go to School at Dawn," appearing in the January 1960 issue. The article points out that the combined audience for Dr. Harvey White's physics course and a course in modern chemistry by Dr. John Baxter, of the University of Florida, had, at that time, climbed over the million mark. Together, according to the article, Drs. White and Baxter had provided instruction that would otherwise have required 1,333 science professors in as many classrooms. Dr. Baxter also found that he can cover in 30 minutes on TV what would take 50 minutes in a classroom. The ability of the camera to produce extreme closeups and the absence of classroom noise, he contends, are additional reasons why ETV has a definite place in our educational system.

With the above arguments in behalf of ETV, coupled with the many letters in favor of ETV that Florida stations have received from enthusiastic viewers, Mr. Speaker, I have become convinced that ETV opens up a complete new educational vista, and I hope that a program of expanding and supporting the present system can be effected.

This must be done, however, without Federal control over such broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction or personnel, and the bill, H.R. 132, is drafted to leave such control to State and local authorities and even as to grants for specific instruction the decisions are left to the State agencies. This is an incentive program as proposed and limited to 3 years.

I shall oppose any effort to inject any degree of control over ETV by the Federal Government, and serve notice to that effect.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132. As a former television news commentator, I know the important job that television can perform in the broad field of education. In view of the obvious need we now face across the Nation for expanded and improved educational facilities, it is imperative that the educational potentialities of television be utilized to the full.

The people of my home city of Schenectady, N.Y., and of the surrounding capital district, have had a chance to become familiar with the value of educational television because of efforts that have been made there over the past several years by the Mohawk-Hudson

Council on Educational Television, in association with the General Electric television station WRGB in Schenectady.

Back in 1953, when television was still in its adolescence, the management of WRGB agreed to set aside time for educational television programming, a novel suggestion at the time. In fact they even proposed the establishment of the Mohawk-Hudson Council on Educational Television to take over the responsibility for operating this vital public service.

This council was created, and with the help of WRGB and WTEN-TV a regular series of educational programs have been carried on in our area. Now a new educational television has been licensed, WMHT, and a drive is under way for funds to put it into operation.

Many other areas in New York State, as well as in other parts of the country, are not even as well situated as we are. In New York the needs of educational television have been badly overlooked by the State authorities. In fact only the other day the State administration reduced funds for educational television to less than one-third of the amount originally proposed as essential to the development and expansion of educational television in our State.

At the present time there are 23 regular television stations in New York, covering every major city and serving the entire geographical area of the State. However, only 7 television channels have been set aside for educational purposes to serve the 17 million people of our State, with many major areas not being covered at all.

Of course the greatest need in making educational television a reality is money. In view of the failure in New York State to meet its full obligations in this regard, we must turn now to the Federal Government for help.

This of course is precisely what this legislation will do. It will fill the gap that now exists. It will begin to tap the vast resources of television for educational benefit. Here is one effective and immediate way in which we in this body can act to improve our Nation's educational standards.

I urge the adoption of this bill, so that station WMHT in Schenectady, and other educational television stations around the country, can continue to do the educational job that desperately needs to be done.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I cast my vote today in opposition to H.R. 132 as amended. This bill, as it came to the floor, was a worthwhile measure and I thoroughly supported its system of matching Federal grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes. In the original version, under section 393, construction grants were available to public agencies in the elementary and secondary school category, to a State TV agency, to public colleges, and under paragraph (a), subparagraph (1) (D), to nonprofit community educational television organizations which could include private colleges and universities as well as other community groups which might be organized on a nonprofit basis to contribute to the excellence of television programming. The effect of the amend-

ment which struck section D and substituted therefor language limiting participation of this program to public agencies only is discriminatory and unfair. Its effect is to deny participation in this very important field of educational television to well-qualified educators who are in a position to make a most valuable contribution in many fields of learning. For example, among others, great universities located in my district, such as Long Island and St. Johns Universities, St. Francis and St. Joseph Colleges would be barred from the program by this amendment. It does not make sense to initiate a broad system of educational benefits to the public at the same time narrowing its base by cutting off and silencing institutions of higher learning merely because they are supported by other than public funds. It is my hope in the House-Senate conference the original language in the bill will be restored and I will have an opportunity to cast my vote in favor of the conference report.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION REFRESHING AND ENLIGHTENING

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 132, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

The purpose of the legislation is to speed up the establishment of additional educational television stations by assisting the States in the development of State programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, and by aiding governmental and private nonprofit agencies concerned with educational television through Federal matching grants in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this legislation is an absolute necessity if we are going to explore to the maximum the educational opportunities presented by this medium of communication. The Federal Government should, and with considerable justification, give financial support to foster this very worthwhile use of television.

As the report from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce states, the Federal Communications Commission has set aside for educational television broadcasting 273 television channels—92 VHF and 181 UHF—out of a total of 2,227 television channels—676 VHF and 1,551 UHF—as of July 29, 1961. During the 9-year period since 1952, when the first of these reservations were made, only 57 educational television stations—41 VHF and 16 UHF—went actually on the air while the Commission authorized 77 educational television stations—47 VHF and 30 UHF—to begin operations.

EDUCATIONAL TV HAS BEEN SUCCESSFUL IN NEW ENGLAND; EXPANSION NEEDED

Mr. Chairman, one of the first non-commercial educational television broadcasting stations in the country, and in 1958 the only one operating along the east coast, was WGBH-TV, channel 2, in Boston, operated by the Lowell Institute Cooperative Broadcasting Council.

Jack Gould, the distinguished television critic for the New York Times, wrote on January 5, 1957, that Boston's channel 2 presents low-cost brain waves and that WGBH-TV gets the top minds for its telecasts. Unfortunately, WGBH-TV's studio was destroyed by fire last October. Let me read to you from Mr. Gould's article in the New York Times of January 13, 1957, concerning educational television:

But it is equally apparent that Madison Avenue has scratched only one side of the medium; educational TV, despite its forbidding title, is one of the most hopeful remedies yet seen for what ails the electronic colossus. The lesson of WGBH-TV is that after a while a viewer can be entertained to death; there does come a time when it is refreshing to have the mind titillated with regularity and purpose.

A drive for funds is now underway to rebuild the WGBH-TV studio and the Ford Foundation has offered up to \$500,000, on a matching fund basis, for a new home for this wonderful New England educational television outlet.

Other areas of the United States have not been as fortunate as we in New England with WGBH-TV. And there is grave danger that unless the process of getting educational television stations on the air is speeded up, the demand to use these channels for commercial television purposes may become irresistible and thus they will be irretrievably lost to education. I urge my colleagues to help prevent this by voting passage of this bill today.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse this measure to authorize aid for educational television. In an age in which increasingly difficult scientific and technical skills are required to assure national growth, educational television offers a way to multiply our teaching resources through better utilization of skills. Experimental educational programs underway at Huntsville, Ala., for instance, in teaching Army men the intricacies of space and rocket guidance equipment, or at Fort Monmouth, N.J., where radar and communications maintenance personnel are taught, offer some idea of ways in which this television tool can be used.

Connecticut is moving to use this field as rapidly as possible, with channel 24 in Hartford as its operating base. An arrangement has been made for this educational channel to use the television towers of VHF channel 3 cooperatively, and will result in school, college, cultural, and educational programming being afforded to the Hartford area. The Connecticut Educational Television Corp. is a nonprofit organization formed to fulfill the responsibility of operating the State's three assigned educational television channels. It has vigorously sought financial aid from private individuals, business and industry, and other sources. The size of the task makes it imperative that all possible help be forthcoming to make this vital national program successful.

Direction and control of the Connecticut Educational Television Corp. are vested in a board of trustees representing the sponsors of educational programs, the participants, private associations and corporations, and other

contributors. This is a broadly based State program and deserves full support.

I want to commend the committee for its study of this subject and its report and urge passage of the bill.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, there is broad agreement among all of us that we must do more to meet the educational needs of our country. Those who have made studies of our schools agree with educators that we must expand and improve our programs at a time in history when we simply cannot settle for second place.

Unfortunately, the sea of education is not a placid one, nor is it free of the rocks and shoals which threaten to bring many Government programs to an unhappy end. Unless we are ever mindful of the dangers involved, we may find to our regret that what begins as Federal aid ends as Federal control. Thus, the problem is really twofold: How to increase and improve our buildings, facilities, and teachers while retaining control at the State and local level.

One answer which meets both elements of the problem is the educational television legislation now before us. Throughout the bill we find numerous safeguards which specifically reserve to the States authority to approve applications and plans before funds are allocated. Those on the local level will be responsible for the way in which educational television programs are used, just as they are now responsible for the use made of textbooks, films, and other educational aids. Conversely, section 398 specifically forbids any Federal department or employee to exercise control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational broadcasting station.

The potential advantages are numerous and are readily apparent to those considering the proposal. We are well aware of the rapidly increasing costs of school construction and maintenance, and of the equally rapid increase in the need for school expansion in the decades ahead. When the cost of this construction is added to the projected cost of teachers' salaries, it is evident that widespread savings could be realized by the use of educational television. In rural areas where the population is scattered, television would permit a better utilization of teachers in order to present a more diversified curriculum and equalize educational opportunities.

It behooves us to act immediately. Today only 20 percent of the channels that are reserved for educational television broadcasting have been utilized, and there is grave danger that unless considerably more stations are soon activated, the demand for commercial purposes may be impossible to turn down. Since the number of channels set aside for educational purposes equals only about 10 percent of all stations, and since the demands made upon them will unquestionably multiply in the years ahead, they should not be lost from lack of use.

Most of the testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was in favor of the bill. Very

few witnesses opposed the legislation and those appearing on behalf of commercial television generally favored the educational television on the grounds that they were not able to adequately supply educational services within the framework of their own networks.

In the final analysis, however, it will be the citizens themselves, acting together at the school, district, and State levels who will determine the success of educational TV. Where civic leaders spend necessary time and energy, we can expect excellent results in the years to come. Already Alabama and Colorado can point with pride to their achievements in this area. I am convinced that with the safeguards written into this bill we can move ahead to obtain better education, with positive assurance that the Federal Government will not prescribe teaching methods or the curriculum. I urge the bill's adoption.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART IV. EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION FACILITIES GRANTS"

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE"

"SEC. 390. The purpose of this part is—
 "(1) to assist (through matching grants) the several States to survey the need and to develop programs for the construction of educational television facilities, and

"(2) to assist (through matching grants) in the construction of educational television facilities.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS"

"SEC. 391. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$520,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums not to exceed \$52,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (2) of section 390.

"GRANTS FOR SURVEYS"

"SEC. 392. (a) To be approved, an application for funds for carrying out the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 390—

"(1) must be made by a duly constituted State educational television agency;

"(2) must provide for the making of a survey and the development of a program by such State educational television agency in accordance with paragraph (1) of section 390; and

"(3) must provide assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that any grant made by the Federal Government under this section will be matched with an equal amount by the State.

"(b) The Secretary shall approve any application for funds which complies with subsection (a).

"(c) The total amount of the grant made to any State for the carrying out of paragraph (1) of section 390 shall not exceed \$10,000.

"STATE PLANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES"

"SEC. 393. Grants under this part for the construction of educational television facilities in a State shall be made only if the

State educational television agency has submitted to the Secretary a State plan embodying a program for such construction. Such State plan shall be so submitted within three years of the date of enactment of this part.

"GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION"

"SEC. 394. (a) For each proposed project for the construction of educational television facilities there shall be submitted to the State educational television agency, for transmission to the Secretary, an application for a grant, and such application shall contain such information with respect to such project as the Secretary shall by regulation require, including the total cost of such project and the amount of the Federal grant requested for such project, and providing assurance satisfactory to the Secretary—

"(1) that necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain the educational television facilities will be available,

"(2) that the operation of such educational television facilities will be under the control of (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) a duly constituted State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from public revenues, or (D) a nonprofit community educational television organization, and

"(3) that such television facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

"(b) Upon receipt of such application the State educational television agency shall determine whether such project is in accordance with the State plan as originally submitted or as modified, and, if it makes such determination, shall transmit such application to the Secretary.

"(c) Whenever a State educational television agency receives applications for construction grants in an aggregate amount exceeding the amount of Federal funds available for the making of such grants in such State, the agency shall indicate the priority given by it to each of the several applications and the amount recommended by it in the case of each application.

"(d) Upon his determination that any application for a grant for a project for the construction of educational television facilities meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary may make a grant to the applicant of an amount not exceeding (1) 50 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project, plus (2) 25 per centum of the reasonable and necessary cost, as determined by the Secretary, of any educational television facilities owned by the applicant on the date on which it files such application; except that the total amount of any grant made under this part with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project.

"(e) The total amount of grants made to applicants from any one State for the carrying out of paragraph (2) of section 390 shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

"(f) No grant shall be made under this part for any project for the construction of educational television facilities in any State after the expiration of the three-year period beginning on the date of submission of a State plan under section 393.

"DEFINITIONS"

"SEC. 395. For the purposes of this part—
 "(1) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(2) The term 'construction of educational television facilities' means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus (including towers, microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, mobile equip-

ment, and video recording equipment) necessary for television broadcasting (including closed circuit television) and does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus.

"(3) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(4) The term 'duly constituted State educational television agency' means (a) a board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State, or (b) a board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law, or (c) a State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public education or higher education within the State which has been designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television; and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the term 'Governor' means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"(5) The term 'nonprofit community educational television organization' means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is representative of elementary schools, colleges, universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations located in the area to be served by educational television facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

"PROVISIONS OF ASSISTANCE BY COMMISSION"

"SEC. 396. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this part as may be requested by the Secretary.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS"

"SEC. 397. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part.

"NO CONTROL OVER TELEVISION BROADCASTING"

"SEC. 398. Nothing in this part shall be deemed to give the Secretary any control over television broadcasting."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART IV—GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING FACILITIES"

"Declaration of purpose"

"SEC. 390. The purpose of this part is—

"(1) to assist (through matching grants) the several States to survey the need and to develop programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, and

"(2) to assist (through matching grants) in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

"Authorization of appropriations"

"SEC. 391. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$520,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until July 1, 1967, for payment of grants with respect to which applications, approved under section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1966.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$25,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (2) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to

this subsection shall remain available for payment of grants for projects for which applications, approved under section 393, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1967.

"Grants for surveys"

"Sec. 392. (a) An application by the State educational television agency of a State for a grant for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 shall be approved by the Commissioner if the Governor of such State, or the Legislature of such State by a duly adopted resolution, certifies to the Commissioner with respect to such application—

"(1) that any grant made to such State by the United States for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 will be matched by an equal amount of State funds; and

"(2) that such grant and such State funds will be used exclusively for making a survey of the need for and utility of additional educational television broadcasting facilities, and for the development of a program by the State educational television agency, for the construction of such facilities, which is based on such survey.

"(b) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under subsection (a) of section 391 the Commissioner shall pay to each State which has an application approved under this section an amount equal to one-half of its expenditures during such year in carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390; except that the total paid to any State under this section may not exceed \$10,000. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made.

"(c) The Commissioner shall encourage area or regional surveys, and development of appropriate construction programs, for areas including any part or parts of more than one State and for such purposes he shall modify the requirements of subsection (a) to the extent he deems necessary to permit and facilitate financial and other cooperation between the State educational television agencies of the States involved.

"Grants for construction"

"Sec. 393. (a) For each project for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities there shall be submitted to the Commissioner an application for a grant containing such information with respect to such project as the Commissioner may by regulation require, including the total cost of such project and the amount of the Federal grant requested for such project, and providing assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner—

"(1) that the applicant is (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) the State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or (D) a nonprofit community educational television organization;

"(2) that the operation of such educational television broadcasting facilities will be under the control of the applicant or a person qualified under paragraph (1) to be such an applicant;

"(3) that necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain such educational television broadcasting facilities will be available when needed; and

"(4) that such television broadcasting facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

"(b) The total amount of grants under this part for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities to be situated in any State shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

"(c) In the case of any State with respect to which an application has been approved under section 392, an application for a grant under this section for a project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities in such State shall be submitted through the State educational television agency of such State; and in such case the Commissioner shall not approve such application under this section unless such agency concurs in or approves such application and, if a State construction program has been developed as provided in subsection (a) (2) of section 392, certifies that such facilities are included in, or construction thereof would be consistent with, such program.

"(d) The Commissioner shall base his determinations of whether to approve applications for grants under this section and the amount of such grants on criteria set forth in regulations and designed to achieve (1) prompt and effective use of all educational television channels remaining available, (2) equitable geographical distribution of educational television broadcasting facilities throughout the States, and (3) provision of educational television broadcasting facilities which will serve the greatest number of persons and serve them in as many areas as possible, and which are adaptable to the broadest educational uses.

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Commissioner shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding (1) 50 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project, plus (2) 25 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of any educational television broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant on the date on which it files such application; except that the total amount of any grant made under this section with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Commissioner to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Commissioner shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

"(f) If, within ten years after completion of any project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities with respect to which a grant has been made under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of such facilities ceases to be an agency, officer, institution, or organization described in subsection (a) (1), or

"(2) such facilities cease to be used for educational television purposes (unless the Commissioner determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation so to do),

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of such facilities the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facilities are situated) of such facilities, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facilities.

"Records"

"Sec. 394. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this part shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out his functions under this part, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied

by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this part.

"Definitions"

"Sec. 395. For the purposes of this part—

"(1) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(2) The term "construction", as applied to educational television broadcasting facilities, means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus (including towers, microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, mobile equipment, and video-recording equipment) necessary for television broadcasting but does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus.

"(3) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(4) The term "State educational television agency" means (A) a board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State, (B) a board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law, or (C) a State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within the State which has been designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television; and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the term "Governor" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"(5) The term "nonprofit community educational television organization" means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations, located in the area to be served by educational television broadcasting facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

"(6) The term "nonprofit" as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"Provision of assistance by Federal Communications Commission"

"Sec. 396. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this part as may be requested by the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall provide for consultation and close cooperation with the Federal Communications Commission in the administration of his functions under this part which are of interest to or affect the functions of such Commission.

"Rules and regulations"

"Sec. 397. The Commissioner is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part, including regulations relating to the order of priority in approving applications for projects under section 393 or to determining the amounts of grants for such projects.

"Federal interference or control prohibited"

"Sec. 398. Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any

educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system."

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct a question to the chairman of the committee. I would like to find out if under the provisions of this bill the investment which has already been made in my State of Wisconsin will qualify for reimbursement under this bill. I am proud of the progress being made in Wisconsin. We have not waited for Federal aid. Under this bill every dollar our State receives will cost Wisconsin taxpayers \$1.36.

Mr. HARRIS. As I have indicated earlier this afternoon, under the provisions of (e), page 12, there will be no reimbursement as such to the station, but on any expansion necessary it may obtain a credit up to 75 percent of the total expansion cost.

Mr. LAIRD. Only on future expansions will they receive any credit under this bill?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman for his helpful explanation. Wisconsin certainly comes out on the short end under this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question with respect to the language on page 11, and see if we can obtain a better definition, under the provision for applicants, of what constitutes a nonprofit community educational television organization.

What specifically is a "nonprofit community educational television organization?" Can the gentleman tell us?

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will turn to page 16 under section 395, "Definitions," he will find a definition of nonprofit community educational television organizations.

I could give an example, if the gentleman would permit.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. HARRIS. The Greater Washington Educational Television Association is an example of this definition.

Mr. GROSS. I take it that on page 16 you were referring to the language from line 6 through line 13; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That paragraph reads:

The term "nonprofit community educational television organization" means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civil, and cultural institutions and organizations, located in the area to be served by educational television broadcasting facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

Now, this says "cultural institutions and organizations." That is not very well defined, it does not seem to me, "and organizations,"—that could be almost any nonprofit organization.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. I thought the gentleman was asking me a question, and that is the reason I was hesitating; I was not sure. I used as an example right here in Washington the Greater Washington Educational Television Association operating UHF channel 26. Now, as a part of that organization there is the Folger Shakespearean Institute, the Corcoran Art Gallery, which is also a part of this. Museums may become interested and join in such an organization. That is the kind of thing we have in mind.

Mr. GROSS. That is what you have in mind. You do not have, for instance, a labor or a farm organization in mind, do you?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly we do not have, and as I stated earlier in the day, conceivably a subsidiary of a labor organization or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce could organize a subsidiary or set up some organization solely for the purpose of educational television and probably come within the provisions of this bill. However, I cannot imagine and simply could not conceive of the Federal Communications Commission approving a license for a subsidiary of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO, as was mentioned here, or some such organization, and I do not believe that there would be any possibility at all for such to happen with this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the gentleman refer to the chamber of commerce, because I was going to ask him if that organization could qualify as well as a labor organization.

Mr. HARRIS. Those two examples were brought up earlier this afternoon.

Mr. GROSS. I am sorry I was not here. Unfortunately, I had to be off the House floor at that time.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. I think the word "organizations" has to be read in the light of the preceding words, because it says "schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions." They must qualify under one of those definitions either as an institution or an organization. I think the qualifying words are the preceding words.

Mr. GROSS. With all due respect, I will have to disagree with the gentleman. When one reads this language referring to schools, colleges, universities, educational and scientific, civic and cultural institutions and organizations, I reemphasize "and organizations," I doubt there is the proper limitation.

Mr. YOUNGER. That includes all of them. I think those are the qualifying words.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEMPHILL to the committee amendment: On page 15, line 10 after "broadcasting," insert the following: "including apparatus which may

incidentally be used for transmitting closed circuit television programs."

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that I spoke of a while ago which allows a closed circuit in connection with broadcasting to participate in this program under the same rules and regulations as outlined in the other parts of the bill. I remember the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] asked me a question about whether or not the FCC would still have some authority. I may have misunderstood the gentleman's question. They would still have authority over any broadcasting, as I understand it, from either a UHF or VHF station. I wanted to clarify that.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. How does the closed circuit operate?

Mr. HEMPHILL. If a closed circuit, either UHF or VHF, used a station to get the program into the closed circuit or into the schools in any way which is contemplated, it would still be under the FCC to that extent.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, they would have only the transmitting license. There would be no other license insofar as the closed circuit is concerned?

Mr. HEMPHILL. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order that the record may be made clear on this bill. I do want it understood as to what the situation is, and the reason why I am agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when we had this particular problem before the committee an amendment was offered to prohibit the use of funds for the purpose of connecting any two facilities. In other words, providing for a cable or relay system or microwave, and so forth. Now, the reason for that amendment was that there were some who were interested in preventing any private ownership of interconnecting facilities. The telephone companies and so forth wanted to have their facilities utilized on a lease basis. The committee considered all of the potentials with reference to the amendment and decided—and I think wisely so—against such a prohibition.

Now, in doing so it was felt that relays and interconnecting systems could be utilized in order that a system of education may be developed within a State. As an example, North Carolina has a pretty good system set up in part of the State, but it does want connections, as I recall the record, with other facilities in other parts of the State.

Now, the committee felt that this legislation should permit that kind of a situation to develop.

Then, the question arose as to the use of the closed circuit educational facilities.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said earlier in the afternoon, to operate a closed circuit broadcasting system, you do not have to get a license from the Federal Communications Commission. You use

leased or privately owned facilities. You do not use the spectrum.

We tried to deal with this subject, and on page 27 of the report you will find the term "broadcasting."

The term "broadcasting," which is used in the definition of "construction" and elsewhere in the committee substitute, is defined in section 3(n) of the Communications Act of 1934 to mean the dissemination of radio communications intended to be received by the public, directly or by the intermediary of relay stations.

That is the language to carry out the intent I described concerning interconnection. Then we provide this language in the report:

Thus, under the committee substitute, grants for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities could not be used to acquire or install transmission apparatus intended for use or to be used for transmitting closed circuit television programs.

What we meant there was transmission apparatus intended exclusively for use in closed circuit television programs. In other words, this is a broadcasting bill for broadcasting facilities—which use the spectrum. Closed circuit television does not use the spectrum. What we intended here was that these funds could not be used for facilities that would be used exclusively for closed circuits. It has got to be for broadcasting facilities. In view of the history made here it becomes necessary to clear up this language and to adopt the language offered by the gentleman from South Carolina which means that you cannot use this fund for the purpose of facilities that will be closed circuit television exclusively. It must be for broadcasting. But it does not prohibit these facilities from being used in connection with closed circuit operations. I want to make that explanation because I think it is important.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

I take this time to make sure that what the chairman means is only the closed circuit which is used in connection with a television transmitter; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Where you have a facility set up under the provisions of this bill for broadcasting purposes and the institution finds it feasible to use some of these facilities in connection with their closed circuit television operations, it would be permitted.

Mr. YOUNGER. But the closed circuit must be used in connection with a licensed broadcasting station?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: Page 11, line 9 after (D) strike out the words "a nonprofit community educational television organization" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "a nonprofit organization consist-

ing solely of entities referred to in the preceding clauses of this paragraph and which is organized solely to engage in educational television broadcasting."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for several reasons. Earlier those who were on the floor heard me ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce whether under the definition of a "nonprofit community educational television organization" the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO would be qualified to receive matching funds under the bill to construct a television facility.

At first the chairman indicated that the answer to that question was definitely and categorically, no. But a few minutes later, he said he believed he should qualify his answer and indicated that, perhaps, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO could qualify if either should organize some sort of a subsidiary organization for educational purposes. Now I am not concerned only about the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO, but I am concerned and wonder what is meant by the language "a nonprofit community educational television organization." The definition on page 16 says it means an "association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges and universities,"—and that is all right so far—but it goes on "and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural organizations." What is a civic organization within the meaning of this bill? A very limited amount of money will be made available by this bill. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] said earlier, a limited number of stations can be constructed with the total funds. Why do we not limit the application of the bill, then, to educational institutions at the elementary, secondary or college level—and we know there is not enough money in this bill to go even that far. But let us limit the bill at that point.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would allow a combination of college, university, elementary or secondary educational agencies to go together and form a nonprofit association to qualify for funds under the bill. While the amendment would permit a combination of agencies to qualify, still they must be educational institutions.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill would be better legislation and I, for one, could give it more enthusiastic support if this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a most mischievous amendment although I am quite confident it is not the purpose of the gentleman to wreak the havoc he would in some areas should this amendment prevail. I can give you two very concrete examples of the types of organizations which would be precluded from any operation of a television station under the terms of the proposed amendment.

In my home city of Sacramento, we have had for about 5 years an educational television station on the air, and about 90 miles to the south and west in San Francisco an educational television

station has been on the air for more than 10 years. These stations are operated by nonprofit organizations broadly representative of educational, civic, and cultural groups in the community—yes, and broadly representative of all of the diverse interests of a community. These stations have been operating entirely on voluntary contributions. They have had a most difficult time. I doubt it would be possible in these two communities to continue to sustain the operation of these stations without the broadly based nonprofit type of support now available.

Mr. Chairman, as to the fears of the gentleman that some particular self-seeking group might gain control, I point out first that those controlling the educational television facilities must be licensed by the Federal Communications Commission. They must submit to the test of an applicant for one of the reserved educational television channels. At the time they apply, if they do not, in fact, speak for the community they seek to serve, that community is going to voice its opposition to the allocation of that channel to the applicant. There can be a comparative test of differing applicants for one of these stations just as there can be for the applicants for commercial television channels. I think we should undertake here to encourage the voluntary association in communities of those who are interested in building better educational facilities and who are willing to give unselfishly of their time and of their resources to support them. We have such stations in operation. There has been no indication in any instance of any one segment of the community attempting to become dominant. The boards of directors are balanced and they render a most worthwhile service to the communities they represent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I shall be very pleased to yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. First of all I think we can agree that any group now organized and operating an educational television station will not be limited in their operations or affected by this bill in any way. We are only talking about what organizations or groups will in the future receive a subsidy of Federal taxpayers' funds for the construction of television facilities.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman has stated something I do not agree with, that those now in existence are not covered under this bill. I think it is contemplated that if present educational channels are to undertake the proper equipping of their facilities, they can qualify on a matching basis for the benefits of this legislation, and I do not want them to be denied that opportunity. They have shown more resourcefulness than that displayed in most of the communities of the Nation in making the progress they have made to date, and I do not want a penalty worked against them because they were resourceful and willing to stand on their own two feet and undertake a pioneering experiment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. MOSS. Certainly I yield further.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should like to make it clear that the question here is not whether the FCC will grant a license or assign a channel to a particular organization or group, because, as the gentleman has pointed out, the FCC grants licenses and assigns channels apart from this legislation. But as a matter of policy we might wish to limit the use of Federal funds to subsidize the construction of facilities. In view of the earlier colloquy with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], apparently it is not beyond the realm of possibility, although it might be unlikely, that funds could be allocated under this bill to help construct educational television facilities for a labor organization or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further to the gentleman at this point, for he is making a statement about something with which I cannot agree. I do not think we are in any danger under the criteria established for the utilization of reserved educational television channels that the FCC would grant these channels to persons or groups we would not regard as being perfectly proper in every sense to receive the benefits of this legislation. On the contrary, I think it is clearly contemplated here that having met that test those groups will be qualified to receive the benefits. The criteria imposed here are very little different from the basic criteria the Communications Commission would utilize in attempting to determine whether it was in truth or in fact an educational effort and whether the service contemplated for the community would be undertaken.

I do not think the gentleman's amendment would do anything but discourage sincere and interested persons from joining together in a community effort to solve their own problems and to meet their own needs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. Certainly I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If you have a truly educational broadcasting setup in Sacramento or the area adjacent thereto, why would they not be able to qualify under the other provisions of the bill? Why would the elimination of subparagraph (d) disqualify them from further broadcasting?

Mr. MOSS. I think you are going here to the type of security in control or ownership of a station; and if you exclude the type of organization which we have in my community, you would exclude my community, and I do not want it excluded, particularly in view at the pioneering effort it has undertaken. I am very proud of the work my home community has done in the educational television field.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to consider another section of this bill, and that is the definition of what "State educational television agency" means. That is definition No. 4. I think we are dealing with a lot of unnecessary fears here because I cannot conceive that either the FCC or the State agency the way it is to be organized would grant a license or make a grant of funds to such an organization as the gentleman fears might get one. I just cannot conceive that that will be done. I am very familiar with the station that operates in San Francisco, WQED. That station is a reserved educational station, channel 9, a VH station. It serves the community. It has educational, cultural, and art features about it. It is paid for by public subscription. It serves a very useful purpose in the city and in the community. It could not qualify under (A), (B), and (C), nor the definitions on page 11, if you strike out the definition (D).

Therefore I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and the amendment to the amendment conclude in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am taking time to call the committee's attention to the language on page 15 defining the term "State" to include the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. This is certainly proper and right as far as it goes. The children of the District and of the Commonwealth should have the same educational advantages offered by television as other American children residing in the States of the Union. I regret, however, that the bill closes the door on American children in Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone. It may be that facilities in those areas are not available at the present time, but I trust that if they are available and Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone desire to participate in the program subsequent legislation will make that possible. Let us not forget that Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone are part of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a 3-year bill. It is limited as to time, and it is limited as to funds. I suggest that the House would be wise to limit the allocation of the public's tax funds to educational institutions and educational agencies or combinations thereof. Later, if the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should desire to go into this subject further and more carefully perhaps it could come up with a better and more meaningful definition upon which an expansion of this program could be based. But, on this basis of this record, I believe we should limit the bill as my amendment indicates.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I must say I have had very serious misgivings about this broad language contained in the bill. As I understand it, the whole matter will go to conference. As far as I am concerned, I am going to support the amendment because I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. I do not think in starting out with this sort of program we should get ourselves spread too far too fast.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment will not be agreed to. If I had the fear which the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Indiana just mentioned a moment ago as to what it would do, I certainly would probably vote for an amendment of this kind. But, I do not have that fear.

Now, then, let me tell you what this will do. It will disqualify the Bay Area Educational TV Association, San Francisco; Educational Television, Inc., Jacksonville, Fla.; Florida West Coast Educational TV, Inc., St. Petersburg; Chicago Educational Television Association, Chicago; WGBH Educational Foundation, Boston; Detroit Educational TV Foundation; Twin City Area Educational TV Corp.; Greater Cincinnati TV Educational Foundation; Greater Toledo Educational TV Foundation; Metropolitan Pittsburgh Educational TV Station; Memphis Community TV Foundation; and Greater Washington Television Association here composed of various organizations organized for this purpose here in Washington, the very organizations that must be given the credit for the miserly progress that we have made in this field now would be the very ones that would be disqualified. And, I do not believe the gentleman would want to do that.

Now, I can say that in my judgment the Committee has considered this thing to the fine point that there would be no possibility that the Federal Communications Commission or the Commissioner of Education or the State educational organizations could permit any abuse of this language here. I know the gentleman does not want to do these things and he just does not know how far-reaching his amendment is. And I hope that this bill will not be completely de-

stroyed and the people who are responsible for this kind of progress are not going to be deprived of the benefits under this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand that the organizations to whom you have referred are now operating under FCC licenses?

Mr. HARRIS. Some of them are, and some are applying for licenses.

Mr. HALLECK. If this amendment were adopted, would it destroy their licenses?

Mr. HARRIS. No, it would not destroy their licenses, but it would prevent their participating with all the other stations in the benefits available under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GRIFFIN) there were—ayes 57, noes 44.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama and Mr. GRIFFIN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 66.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YATES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 132) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 552, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that the amendment that was adopted in the Committee of the Whole was to an amendment of the committee amendment and therefore the amendment as amended is what we were voting on?

The SPEAKER. That is correct; and it was agreed to. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 339, nays 68, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—339

Abbott	Fenton	Libonati
Adair	Finnegan	Lindsay
Addonizio	Fino	Loser
Albert	Flood	McCulloch
Alexander	Flynt	McDowell
Alford	Fogarty	McFall
Andersen,	Ford	Macdonald
Minn.	Forrester	MacGregor
Anfuso	Frazier	Mack
Arends	Frelinghuysen	Madden
Ashley	Friedel	Magnuson
Ashmore	Fulton	Mahon
Aspinall	Gallagher	Maillard
Auchincloss	Garland	Martin, Mass.
Ayres	Garmatz	Martin, Nebr.
Baker	Gary	Mason
Baldwin	Gathings	Mathias
Barry	Gavin	Matthews
Bass, N.H.	Gialmo	May
Bass, Tenn.	Gilbert	Meador
Bates	Glenn	Merrow
Battin	Gonzalez	Miller, Clem
Becker	Gooding	Miller,
Beckworth	Grant	George P.
Belcher	Gray	Miller, N.Y.
Bennett, Fla.	Green, Oreg.	Milliken
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	Mills
Blitch	Griffin	Minshall
Boggs	Griffiths	Monagan
Boland	Gross	Montoya
Bolling	Gubser	Moore
Bolton	Hagan, Ga.	Moorehead,
Bonner	Hagen, Calif.	Ohio
Boykin	Haley	Moorhead, Pa.
Brademas	Halleck	Morgan
Breeding	Halpern	Morris
Brewster	Hansen	Morse
Bromwell	Harding	Mosher
Brooks, Tex.	Hardy	Moss
Broomfield	Harris	Moulder
Brown	Harrison, Wyo.	Multer
Broyhill	Harsha	Murphy
Burke, Ky.	Harvey, Ind.	Murray
Burke, Mass.	Harvey, Mich.	Natcher
Byrne, Pa.	Hays	Nedzi
Cannon	Healey	Nix
Cederberg	Hébert	Norblad
Celler	Hechler	Nygaard
Chamberlain	Hemphill	O'Brien, Ill.
Chenoweth	Henderson	O'Brien, N.Y.
Chipperfield	Herlong	O'Hara, Ill.
Clark	Hoeven	O'Hara, Mich.
Coad	Hollifield	Olsen
Cohelan	Holland	O'Neill
Collier	Huddleston	Osmers
Conte	Hull	Ostertag
Cook	Ichord, Mo.	Passman
Cooley	Inouye	Patman
Corbett	Jarman	Pelly
Corman	Jennings	Perkins
Cramer	Joelson	Peterson
Curtin	Johnson, Calif.	Pfost
Curtis, Mass.	Johnson, Md.	Philbin
Curtis, Mo.	Johnson, Wis.	Pike
Daddario	Jonas	Pilcher
Dague	Jones, Mo.	Pillion
Daniels	Judd	Pirnie
Davis,	Karsten	Poff
James C.	Karth	Price
Davis, John W.	Kastenmeier	Pucinski
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Purcell
Dawson	Kee	Quile
Denton	Keith	Randall
Derounian	Keogh	Rains
Diggs	Kilgore	Reece
Dingell	King, Calif.	Relfel
Dominick	King, Utah	Reuss
Donohue	Kirwan	Rhodes, Pa.
Dooley	Kitchin	Riehlman
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Rivers, Alaska
Downing	Knox	Rivers, S.C.
Dulski	Kornegay	Roberts, Ala.
Durno	Kowalski	Robison
Dwyer	Kunkel	Rodino
Edmondson	Landrum	Rogers, Colo.
Elliot	Lane	Rogers, Fla.
Ellsworth	Langen	Rogers, Tex.
Everett	Lankford	Roosevelt
Evins	Latta	Rosenthal
Farbstein	Lennon	Rostenkowski
Feighan	Lesinski	Roush
		Rutherford

Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schenck
Schneebell
Schwengel
Scott
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.

Spence
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Utt

Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Weis
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Willson, Calif.
Willson, Ind.
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—68

Abernethy
Addabbo
Alger
Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Avery
Beermann
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bray
Bruce
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Carey
Casey
Church
Clancy
Colmer
Cunningham
Delaney
Derwinski

Devine
Dole
Dorn
Fascell
Findley
Fisher
Fountain
Hall
Hiestand
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Hosmer
Jensen
Johansen
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kyl
Laird
Lipscomb
McDonough
McMillan
McSweeney
McVey

Marshall
Michel
Moeller
Nelsen
Norrell
Poage
Ray
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts, Tex.
Roudebush
Rousset
Schadeberg
Scherer
Short
Smith, Calif.
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Williams
Winstead

NOT VOTING—29

Andrews
Baring
Barrett
Bennett, Mich.
Buckley
Cahill
Chelf
Dent
Doyle
Fallon

Granahan
Harrison, Va.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jones, Ala.
Kelly
McIntire
Morrison
O'Konski
Powell
Rooney

Schweiker
Scranton
Selden
Smith, Miss.
Thompson, N.J.
Whitten
Wright
Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Harrison of Virginia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Powell with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Scranton.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. McIntire.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Schweiker.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 205, and to strike everything after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 132 as passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Arkansas just what it is he proposes to do? I could not understand the gentleman's request.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the other body passed a bill. It is pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives. The House has just passed a bill reported by the committee. I am merely taking from our committee the Senate bill, striking out all after the enacting clause, and inserting the language of the House bill just passed.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to assist the States and certain organizations therein to establish or improve television broadcasting for educational purposes, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, by providing for the establishment and improvement of television broadcasting facilities.

SEC. 2. Any agency or officer, or organization in a State, described in clause (b) (2) of this section, which is establishing or improving television broadcasting facilities, may receive a grant as authorized in this Act to cover the cost of such establishment or improvement by—

(a) making application therefor in such form as is prescribed by the United States Commissioner of Education; and

(b) providing assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner of Education—

(1) that the necessary funds to operate and maintain such facilities will be available;

(2) that the operation of such facilities will be under the control of (a) the agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, (b) a duly constituted State educational television commission, or (c) a State controlled college or university, except that any such agency, officer, commission, college or university may for the purposes of this Act distribute funds received under this Act to nonprofit foundations, corporations, or associations in the same State which are organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting if the operation of the facilities which such funds are used to establish or improve will be under the control of such nonprofit organization; and

(3) that such facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon determining that an agency or officer of an organization has satisfied the requirements of section 2 of this Act, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make a grant to such agency, officer, or organization in such amount as is determined by the Commissioner to be reasonable and necessary to cover the cost of such establishment or improvement of facilities. An agency or officer or an organization may receive one or more grants under the provisions of this Act, but the total amount of such grants for television broadcasting facilities in any State shall not exceed \$1,000,000. Such grants shall be made out of funds appropriated for the purposes of this Act, and may be made in such installments as the Commissioner deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act the term "establishing or improving television broadcasting facilities" means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus necessary for television (including closed-circuit television) broadcasting, and does not include the construction or repair of structures to

house such apparatus, and the term "State" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5 The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this Act as may be requested by the Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed (a) to give the Commissioner of Education any control over television broadcasting, or (b) to amend any provision of, or requirement under, the Federal Communications Act.

SEC. 7. No application for any grant under this Act may be accepted by the Commissioner of Education after the day which is five years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. (a) Each recipient of assistance under section 3 of this Act shall keep such records as the Commissioner shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under section 3 of this Act.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART IV—GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING FACILITIES

"Declaration of purpose

"SEC. 390. The purpose of this part is—

"(1) to assist (through matching grants) the several States to survey the need and to develop programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, and

"(2) to assist (through matching grants) in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 391. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$520,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until July 1, 1967, for payment of grants with respect to which applications, approved under section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1966.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$25,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (2) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available for payment of grants for projects for which applications, approved under section 393, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1967.

"Grants for surveys

"SEC. 392. (a) An application by the State educational television agency of a State for

a grant for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 shall be approved by the Commissioner if the Governor of such State, or the legislature of such State by a duly adopted resolution, certifies to the Commissioner with respect to such application—

"(1) that any grant made to such State by the United States for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 will be matched by an equal amount of State funds; and

"(2) that such grant and such State funds will be used exclusively for making a survey of the need for and utility of additional educational television broadcasting facilities, and for the development of a program by the State educational television agency, for the construction of such facilities, which is based on such survey.

"(b) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under subsection (a) of section 391 the Commissioner shall pay to each State which has an application approved under this section an amount equal to one-half of its expenditures during such year in carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390; except that the total paid to any State under this section may not exceed \$10,000. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made.

"(c) The Commissioner shall encourage area or regional surveys, and development of appropriate construction programs, for areas including any part or parts of more than one State and for such purposes he shall modify the requirements of subsection (a) to the extent he deems necessary to permit and facilitate financial and other cooperation between the State educational television agencies of the States involved.

"Grants for construction

"SEC. 393. (a) For each project for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities there shall be submitted to the Commissioner an application for a grant containing such information with respect to such project as the Commissioner may by regulation require, including the total cost of such project and the amount of the Federal grant requested for such project, and providing assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner—

"(1) that the applicant is (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) the State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or (D) a nonprofit organization consisting solely of entities referred to in the preceding clauses of this paragraph and which is organized solely to engage in educational television broadcasting;

"(2) that the operation of such educational television broadcasting facilities will be under the control of the applicant or a person qualified under paragraph (1) to be such an applicant;

"(3) that necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain such educational television broadcasting facilities will be available when needed; and

"(4) that such television broadcasting facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

"(b) The total amount of grants under this part for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities to be situated in any State shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

"(c) In the case of any State with respect to which an application has been approved under section 392, an application for a grant under this section for a project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities in such State shall be sub-

mitted through the State educational television agency of such State; and in such case the Commissioner shall not approve such application under this section unless such agency concurs in or approves such application and, if a State construction program has been developed as provided in subsection (a) (2) of section 392, certifies that such facilities are included in, or construction thereof would be consistent with, such program.

"(d) The Commissioner shall base his determinations of whether to approve applications for grants under this section and the amount of such grants on criteria set forth in regulations and designed to achieve (1) prompt and effective use of all educational television channels remaining available, (2) equitable geographical distribution of educational television broadcasting facilities throughout the States, and (3) provision of educational television broadcasting facilities which will serve the greatest number of persons and serve them in as many areas as possible, and which are adaptable to the broadcast educational uses.

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Commissioner shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding (1) 50 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project, plus (2) 25 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of any educational television broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant on the date on which it files such application; except that the total amount of any grant made under this section with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Commissioner to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Commissioner shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

"(f) If, within ten years after completion of any project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities with respect to which a grant has been made under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of such facilities ceases to be an agency, officer, institution, or organization described in subsection (a) (1), or

"(2) such facilities cease to be used for educational television purposes (unless the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation so to do),

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of such facilities the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facilities are situated) of such facilities, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facilities.

"Records

"Sec. 394. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this part shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out his functions under this part, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives,

shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this part.

"Definitions

"Sec. 395. For the purposes of this part—
"(1) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(2) The term "construction", as applied to educational television broadcasting facilities, means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus (including towers, microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, mobile equipment, and video-recording equipment) necessary for television broadcasting, including apparatus which may incidentally be used for transmitting closed circuit television programs, but does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus.

"(3) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(4) The term "State educational television agency" means (A) a board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State, (B) a board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law, or (C) a State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within the State which has been designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television; and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the term "Governor" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"(5) The term "nonprofit community educational television organization" means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations, located in the area to be served by educational television broadcasting facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

"(6) The term "nonprofit" as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"Provision of assistance by Federal Communications Commission

"Sec. 396. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this part as may be requested by the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall provide for consultation and close cooperation with the Federal Communications Commission in the administration of his functions under this part which are of interest to or affect the functions of such Commission.

"Rules and regulations

"Sec. 397. The Commissioner is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part, including regulations relating to the order of priority in approving applications for projects under section 393 or to determining the amounts of grants for such projects.

"Federal interference or control prohibited

"Sec. 398. Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system."

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 132) was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, ROBERTS of Alabama, MOULDER, MOSS, SPRINGER, YOUNGER, and SCHENCK.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 6, 1962, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9013. An act to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice.

PROGRAM PRACTICES OF TELEVISION NETWORKS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this month the Federal Communications Commission ended an investigation, spanning 3 years, into program practices of television networks. The compiled testimony covers about 12,000 pages.

Among the elements in the investigation are the displays of violence, program ratings, the role of affiliated

stations in selecting programs, and regulation of the industry by the Federal Government.

Several months from now, the FCC will forward its findings to the Congress with possible recommendations for legislation affecting both stations and networks. I am hopeful that the quality of programs, both public service and entertainment, will be improved. Many of us have watched with great expectations the arrival of Chairman Newton N. Minow to the FCC. He has succeeded, with all the frustrations, self-imposed and acquired, of the agency in provoking needed discussion among Americans about the state of both radio and television.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hour is not too late; the situation need not have become what it is.

I think it instructive to delve into the fledgling years of broadcasting when radio had not quite grown out of toyhood into a social force. Interestingly, at about the same time, indeed almost in the same year, two men, one an American, the other a Briton, recognized the problem that arose with the general dissemination, as opposed to point-to-point transmission, of messages by wireless.

The Briton was Lord Reith, father of the British Broadcasting Corp.—BBC. He foresaw that "the temptation to exploit large numbers of people has grown as it has become abundantly clear that effective technical means lie at the disposal of would-be exploiters and that the profits of exploitation are huge." He saw radio—TV was then a laboratory infant—as Promethean fire that needed fire lanes.

The American was Herbert Hoover. Now, Mr. Speaker, I concede that I do not have frequent occasion to quote the former President. But I found it most interesting in this research to learn Mr. Hoover's views on the responsibility both of the Federal Government and of the private broadcaster. And I must say—to borrow a political term and with no disrespect due Mr. Hoover—that he stands somewhat to the "left" of both the prevailing view in radio and television circles and, unfortunately, the regulatory Federal Communications Commission itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, eccentric as it may sound today, Mr. Hoover represented views of the many public-spirited citizens when he subscribed to a theory built upon an assumption that unrestrained commercial motivation pollutes the public air.

Remember that the Radio Broadcasting Act of 1927, a basic statute, was framed during the administration of Calvin Coolidge who once made the doleful statement that the chief business of Government is business.

And President Coolidge's Secretary of Commerce was Herbert Hoover. And what was Mr. Hoover's philosophy? It was this: That the Federal Government is entitled to compel an applicant for a broadcasting license "to prove there is something more than naked commercial selfishness in his purposes."

Testifying at a hearing on the 1927 legislation, Mr. Hoover told members of

the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee:

It is inconceivable that the American people will allow the newborn system of communication to fall exclusively into the power of any individual group or combination.

Radio communication is not to be considered as merely a business carried on for private gain, for private advertisement or for entertainment of the curious. It is a public concern impressed with the public trust and to be considered primarily from the standpoint of public interest to the same extent and upon the basis of the same general principles as our other public utilities.

Mr. Hoover at one point withdrew his support for the lengthy regulatory bill and suggested a short bill that vested control in the Secretary of Commerce. The preamble to this short bill stated:

That it is hereby declared and reaffirmed that the ether within the limits of the United States, its territories and possessions, is the inalienable possession of the people.

His proposed draft was not accepted. And in a prophetic warning, Mr. Hoover said:

It has been found possible by indirect advertising to turn broadcasting to highly profitable use. If this were misused we would be confronted with the fact that service more advantageous to the listeners would be crowded out for advertising purposes.

The 1927 act I referred to a moment ago specified that although a radio station may be operated as a commercial venture, the license holder's commercial privilege must be "subordinated to his paramount obligation for the community and must be incidental to his trusteeship."

And the following year the Federal Radio Commission stated:

While it is true that broadcasting stations in this country are for the most part supported or partially supported by advertisers, broadcasting stations are not given these great privileges by the U.S. Government for the primary benefit of advertisers. Such benefit as is derived by advertisers must be incidental and entirely secondary to the interest of the public. Where a station is used for broadcasting of a considerable amount of what is called direct advertising, the advertising is usually offensive to the listening public. It should be incidental to some real service rendered to the public, and not the main object of a program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, note this philosophy and then judge how far astray we have come when we listen to the president of the Columbia Broadcasting System in 1960. He stated at an FCC hearing that a program "in which a large part of the audience is interested is, by that very fact, a program in the public interest." Not to be outdone, another network chieftain, Robert Sarnoff, president of the National Broadcasting Co., declared during his appearance:

Permit me to clarify one point. A network is not under any legal compulsion to meet FCC requirements for a balanced program.

Now the speciousness of the first statement and the arrogance of the second pronouncement unfortunately are ingredients in the cake of custom that has been baked since Mr. Hoover and

others tried unsuccessfully to set a guide for broadcasting.

In a recent article in the *American Scholar*, it was pointed out that the two basic statutes in this field, the acts of 1927 and 1934, provide, in effect, not that advertising agencies and sponsors and networks should be good but indeed that they should be in effect powerless. The FCC has said as recently as 1960 that—

The selection, supervision, and control of all broadcast matter should remain the undivided and unshared responsibility of station licensees in local communities. Any responsibility placed on networks should not substitute for, but should serve and implement, the basic duty of licensees as trustees to provide broadcasting service in the public interest.

Now, of course, as can be judged from reading testimony before the FCC, networks and advertising agencies are in complete control of broadcasting matter.

There was fair warning that this dolorous state of affairs would come to pass. I have reached this conclusion upon the basis of a detailed reading of the debates on the 1927 and 1934 legislations.

Now it is instructive, Mr. Speaker, to go behind the Radio Broadcasting Act of 1927 and the Federal Communications Act of 1934, the two key statutes in the field, to read the record as these pieces of legislation were being discussed on the floor of both the House and the Senate.

Now no one can read the lengthy documentation, the legislative history of these measures, if you will, without feeling the vast uneasiness and the dissatisfaction of the Senators and Representatives with the final legislative product.

For example, a large part of the month of February in 1927, the Senate discussed proposed regulations in the field. There is evidence the radio industry conducted a pressure campaign among listeners in an effort to end the debate and pass the inadequate 1927 legislation. During the legislative discussion of both the 1927 and 1934 acts there emerged conference reports that represented a considerable diminution of the original intent of the sponsors.

The 1927 legislation was passed amid frequent expressions that there was not being provided sufficient authority to the Federal Government to allocate wavelengths, determine power that stations should use and fix location of those stations. The bill, or more properly the conference report, seems to have been passed mainly because of the expressed fear that unless the report was adopted the radio station owners would at that time through pleas that through prior appropriation of wavelengths they have acquired rights which the courts would enforce. Better some attempt at regulation than none carried the legislative day.

On the House floor, the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative DAVIS, asked:

If we are going to surrender the rights of the American people and take back our assertion that this great right, the use of the ether, should be for the public benefit and for all of the people; that it belongs to the American people and not to the American

Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Radio Corp. of America or any other member of this monopoly.

Senators La Follette and Borah vigorously protested cropping in conference of a Senate provision that stated that both power to regulate as well as the ownership of the ether and the channels exist in the Government. The provision stated:

The Federal Government intends forever to preserve and maintain the channels of radio transmission as perpetual medium under the control and for the people of the United States.

Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, addressing the President of the Senate, said:

I do not think, sir, that in the 14 years I have been here there has ever been a question before the Senate that in the very nature of the thing Senators can know so little about as this subject.

Senator Pittman expressed dismay at another watering down of the original Senate bill. He particularly wondered what happened to a Senate provision that no license shall be granted until an applicant, either for a license or for a renewal of a license, has signed under oath a waiver of any claim of right to any wavelength or to the use of the ether because of a previous use of the same whether by license or otherwise. The only service rendered by the conference report, said Senator Pittman dolefully, is "service to a future monopoly, that is all."

Now let us turn to discussion on the Senate floor of the legislation that became known as the Communications Act of 1934.

Senator Wagner, of New York, typified those who wanted stronger protections for radio listeners. He suggested that all licenses be picked up and that the newly proposed Federal Communications Commission shall reallocate all frequencies, power, and time assignments.

He further suggested an amendment that failed of passage. It would have made it mandatory that the FCC reserve and allocate only to educational, religious, agricultural, labor, cooperative and similar non-profit-making associations one-fourth—25 percent—of all the radio broadcasting facilities within its jurisdiction. Commercial stations enjoying free use of the air have captured 98 percent of the broadcasting, he said.

Senator Fess, of Ohio, declared:

Everyone must be impressed with the pollution of the air for commercial purposes until it is actually nauseating.

And, interestingly, he pointed out that the invention of the Linotype did not turn policy and practice of journalism over to mechanics and machinery salesmen and yet radio is and always has been dominated absolutely by the close-knit industries of its technical manufacturing and production branches.

Senator White suggested the FCC be given the power, nay, the express duty of establishing priorities in the character of service.

The Senate bill did contain a provision, dropped in conference, that was a faint

shadow of the LaFollette proposal. It said the FCC shall study the proposal that Congress by statute allocate fixed percentages of radio broadcasting facilities to particular types or kinds of non-profit radio programs or to persons identified with particular types or kinds of nonprofit radio programs or to persons identified with particular types or kinds of nonprofit activities and shall report to Congress, not later than February 1, 1935, its recommendations with the reasons.

Well, effort after effort on the Senate floor was made unsuccessfully to lessen the commercialization of the airwaves.

And now today, 28 years later to the month, the huckster, in whose view the network audience is peopled by two categories of humans—highbrow and lowbrow—rules. His premise is that tastes are inborn or inherited rather than acquired. A sort of Ricardo iron law of tastes. Well, I suggest parenthetically there is at least a third category—the broadbrow.

Somewhere it has been written that we are a nation scarred by private luxury and public squalor. Small wonder when the principal formal avenue of information and entertainment, Mr. Speaker, is devoted to pandering to the greedy consumer that lurks inside each of us. Have we forgotten that basically salesmen, whether appearing with or without white coats on our television screens, are a bother; that businessmen are after all attempting principally to buy cheap and sell dear; and neither operates under the King's writ?

Let us be mindful of George Bernard Shaw's counsel:

We must get what we want, or we shall come to want what we get.

The Senate subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency has reported in its studies that during so-called prime viewing hours programs depicting crime and violence have risen from one-sixth of the total programming time to one-half. Add the commercial billingsgate which interlace these programs and we have a witch's oplate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the operation in Great Britain. The comparison has been made before. I do not think that in all ways its methods are adaptable to this country. But I am impressed that on the average on the commercial television network, the Independent Television Authority, advertising is limited to 6 minutes each hour. Advertisers neither produce nor control programs. They cannot sponsor whole shows or buy time on a particular program. The station operator places the advertisement. The idea seems to be to please all the people some of the time—not some of the people all of the time.

There is, in other words, no cultural apartheid—no Sunday afternoon ghetto for the "better class" of people.

I think this is important to mention, because we should not be sobersides about this. We should not be esthetic prigs. I do not advocate turning broadcasting over to some monastic community having no contact with the admin-

istration of life. There has been some nonsense written and spoken about this.

On one hand, we should not have nightly on television a reading of both the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and Hansard. Surely, this would weaken the Atlantic Alliance, cause political scientists to weep, and our constituents to laugh. On the other hand, there should be a lessening of glorification of violence, lawlessness, and passion without reason.

Programs can be popular and "good"—although the judgment is an esthetic not a moral one—and "good" but yet popular. Frequently the "mass" audience for one kind of program is not the "mass" audience for another.

Now there have been many proposals aimed at redressing the balance is programming. These have been advanced because the networks themselves have done little. One approach would touch directly on the programming itself. There is another approach—to assist financially and technically projects that will provide the facilities. H.R. 132 does this. It would amend the 1934 Communications Act by establishing a program of matching Federal grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes. This has been thoroughly discussed.

As of last July, the FCC had set aside for educational television broadcasting 273 TV channels out of 2,227 channels. Only 57 educational television stations actually went on the air.

There is grave danger, as the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has pointed out, that unless the process of getting educational TV stations on the air is speeded, the demand to use these channels for commercial television purposes may become irresistible and thus they will become irretrievably lost to education.

I suggest, too, that we might call upon the FCC to study the proposal I referred to a few minutes ago—this is the one that there be a fixed allocation of radio and television broadcasting facilities to educational, cultural, and other similar non-profit-making associations.

Is it an extravagant hope that we shall brake the merchants and panderers of the airwaves? I am hopeful that under the distinguished chairmanship of Mr. Minow, the FCC will finally assume its share of the responsibility for eliminating the disordered quality of our radio and television programs.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 556) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 556

Resolved, That Benjamin S. Rosenthal, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Veterans' Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOUNDERS DAY ADDRESS TO BE MADE BY VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON is to make the Founders Day address and to receive a honorary degree tomorrow, March 8, at Elon College. Elon College, established and supported by the Congregational Christian denomination, is one of the old and fine church-related institutions of higher learning located in my congressional district. Dr. Earl Danieley, the president of Elon College, has invited me to attend and participate in this auspicious occasion. My plans are to accompany the Vice President to the Sixth District of North Carolina tomorrow. I understand that there will be some business conducted on the floor of the House tomorrow, but I feel that the occasion of the Vice President's visit to my district justifies my absence from tomorrow's session of the House. I will arrange to be paired in the event any record vote is taken.

CUT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO 200 MEMBERS?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to reduce the size of the House of Representatives to 200 Members. Present permanent membership is 435. Present temporary membership is 437. A bill is before the Committee on Rules to boost that figure to 438.

The history of legislation on the size of the House shows consideration has been given primarily to the issue of enlarging it. Bills have been taken up in the atmosphere of political crisis following a decennial census and the political urgencies of both States and Congressmen whose districts are being abolished. The House has grown to its present size largely because of these considerations. They may or may not have operated to fix the size of the House logically. The record is relatively barren of sober discussion and evaluation as to what, in reality, should be a proper size for the U.S. House of Representatives under present-day conditions.

In political theory the size of a legislative body should, in part, take into consideration the number of Members necessary and appropriate:

First. To get its work done efficiently. Too many or too few Members can result in an ineffective legislature.

Second. To provide adequate representation of the electorate. A body which is too large and unwieldy may de-

feat this end as certainly as one which is too small.

Third. For economical operation of the legislative body. More Members than necessary, plus their tax supported staffs, can be a waste of public money.

Fourth. For fixing legislative responsibility and leadership. In too large a body responsibility is so diffused that leadership in the nonpartisan sense becomes difficult to exercise. In too small a body responsibility becomes concentrated beyond a Member's capacity to discharge it leading to the exercise of improper governmental powers and authority by nonelected staff members in congressional offices and committees.

The number 200 arbitrarily was selected as a starting point for consideration, being twice the size of the other body and probably the smallest size anyone would wish to consider. It most probably is smaller than what would be determined to be the most satisfactory size for House membership. After hearings the bill could be amended by inserting what careful examination and study shows to be a proper size for the House. It might disclose the proper number to be 300, the present 435, the proposed 438, or even more. But no reasonable judgment can be made on the matter unless and until such a review is made under circumstances in which reapportionment pressures are absent. The only way to get one seems to be to have hearing on a bill of this nature. I am certain that should it show the size of the House should be reduced, no Member would permit consideration of his own political fortunes to influence his support of beneficial legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and just missed rollcall No. 30. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 132.

DEFENSE EXPENDITURES IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on 18 occasions during 1959 and 1960, I took the floor to point out the different ways in which the State of West Virginia has been shortchanged in the past, in terms of Federal Government installations and spending.

For example, West Virginia in 1959 and 1960 had the highest rate of unemployment of any State in the Union, yet the lowest number of Department of Commerce employees per capita. During the Korean conflict West Virginia had the highest number of its young men per capita in the entire Nation who were killed or wounded in the Korean conflict, yet in 1959 and 1960 West Virginia ranked 50th among the States in

defense expenditures and defense installations in proportion to population.

I am attempting to compile up-to-date figures which will indicate that even with the economic progress she has made in the past year, West Virginia still has a long way to go before anyone can claim that she gets better than average treatment so far as Federal facilities are concerned.

This is why I was very much interested yesterday, during the debate on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, to hear the discussion on the placement of an Internal Revenue Service facility in Martinsburg, W. Va., and the assignment of additional interstate mileage to the State of West Virginia. During the discussion, there was some contention that these decisions may have been made for political considerations.

Mr. Speaker, although I am sure that these decisions were made for the good of the people of the Nation, I cannot resist making one more observation in view of the way in which West Virginia has been shortchanged for so many years.

I am proud that West Virginia has in effect rejoined the Union and is receiving her measure of recognition from the Kennedy administration. I am proud that West Virginia at last is receiving a fair break. For all too many years, West Virginia has been shoved to the bottom of the heap. Some may claim that this recognition of West Virginia is politics. If the current attention fairly given to the State of West Virginia be politics, then I say let us have some more of the same kind of politics.

JUNIUS SCALES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, a bleeding-heart campaign has been launched to bring about Presidential clemency for Junius Scales, former leader of the Communist Party's Carolinas district. To date, Scales has served only 5 months of a 6-year prison sentence for violating the membership clause of the Smith Act. This clause makes it a felony for anyone knowingly to join or retain membership in an organization which advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Clemency-for-Scales articles are appearing in leftwing publications, and that peculiar breed of American who simply cannot believe that anyone except an anti-Communist would do this Nation harm is shedding his tears for Scales in letters to the editors of leading newspapers. Editorials in the New York Times and the Washington Post, two Goliaths of the weeping willow world, have jumped on the Scales bandwagon. In addition, the Washington

Post ran a paid mercy-for-Scales plea entitled "Wanted: Presidential Clemency."

What are the reasons given by those who seek to have Junius Scales released from the Federal penitentiary? The most frequently appearing ones are as follows:

First. Scales is the only person to be convicted under the membership clause of the Smith Act.

Second. Scales renounced communism in 1957, nearly 4 years before he began serving his prison term.

Third. The Communist Party is having the last laugh because the U.S. Government has jailed one of the party's defectors.

Fourth. It is wrong to have an ex-Communist in jail while some 10,000 active Communists remain free.

Fifth. Evidence against Scales was obtained from paid informers.

Sixth. Scales was imprisoned as punishment for not having informed on his former comrades after he broke with the Communist Party in 1957.

Well, at the risk of being charged by the bleeding hearts with having emotions of granite, I most strongly reject their arguments for freeing Scales so soon after he has gone to prison. When I think of the hundreds of thousands of Americans who have given their lives in battle to preserve this Nation, I cannot be convinced that at least 2 years—the minimum period Scales must serve to become eligible for parole—is too long an imprisonment for an unrepentant man who cast his lot with a foreign-directed conspiracy bent on destroying the United States. Even if Scales is not paroled at the end of 2 years, he could reduce considerably his time in jail by good conduct.

Who is Junius Scales? What are the facts about his Communist Party membership, his conviction, and his prison sentence?

Scales was not an entrapped dupe or a victim of circumstances when he joined the Communist Party in 1940. As a student at the University of North Carolina, as the son of a wealthy attorney, as the grand nephew of a Governor of North Carolina, and as a descendant of college presidents, a Confederate general, ministers, editors, Revolutionary War soldiers, and colonial judges reportedly dating back to 1623 in American history, Scales had far better reason than most U.S. Communists to know what he was betraying, for his was indeed a rich heritage.

It must be assumed, therefore, that he walked into the Communist Party with his eyes wide open. With his background, he probably gave the party more respectability than it dared hope to attain in the Carolinas. It is little wonder that the party made Scales the chairman of its North Carolina-South Carolina district in 1947. He held the post for 10 years.

The question before the courts in the Scales case, of course, was whether he knowingly had belonged to an organization which advocated the overthrow of the U.S. Government by use of force and violence. Although it is not my intention to retry the case here, I do think

it important to point out the findings of the lower courts, upheld by the Supreme Court, that first, Communist doctrine does subscribe to the use of force and violence in its plan for overthrowing the Government of the United States; second, Scales was for years a high party functionary and a knowledgeable authority on Communist doctrine; and third, on at least one occasion at a secret Communist training school, of which Scales was a director and with Scales watching, an instructor taught and demonstrated how a person on a picket line could kill an opponent by stabbing a pencil point into his heart or throat. In view of these findings, it is inconceivable that Scales was unaware of what the Communist Party advocated. In any event, the issues of his knowledge and his intent were conclusively settled by the verdicts of the juries in two trials.

Now, I again invite your attention to those Communist-serving arguments about why Scales should be prematurely released from prison. The first one I mentioned was that Scales is the only person the Government has been able to prosecute successfully for violation of the Smith Act's membership clause. This, to me, is a meaningless argument. Just because Col. John Glenn is the only American to have orbited the earth does that mean his accomplishment should be discounted. Does it mean that if the next American who tries to orbit the earth is unsuccessful, Glenn's feat would be nullified? Any answer but "no" to these questions would be ridiculous. In short, if it were necessary to convict a second and a third person of a wrongdoing before a first person could be convicted for the same offense, then no one could ever be imprisoned for anything. And, as all of us realize, the Congress has yet to pass legislation for the purpose of not having it enforced.

Furthermore, the very fact that Scales was the first person—and so far the only person—sent to jail by the membership clause of the Smith Act indicates to me that he had to have been a most flagrant violator of that clause when I consider the words of Supreme Court Justice Harlan, who delivered the majority opinion in the Scales case. Justice Harlan said:

Although this Court will often strain to contrive legislation so as to save it against constitutional attack, it must not and will not carry this to the point of perverting the purpose of a statute.

The second point the bleeding hearts are making is that Scales renounced communism in 1957, thereby removing the need for sending him to prison. This appeal cannot be dismissed lightly, because it is the most effective sympathy-winning gimmick they have. In a letter to the Greensboro Daily News, printed by that newspaper on December 18, 1957, Scales said that he had not paid party dues since the previous January and that he had stopped being a member after the party's February—1957—convention. Scales cited "the Hungarian thing" and the "Khrushchev secret report"—attacking Stalin—as factors contributing toward his decision to withdraw from the party.

So, in sum, we know that Scales has said that he broke with the party. But does this mean that he actually did so? I recall that Scales also insisted publicly back in the 1940's that the Communist Party of the United States is not dominated by the Soviet Union. The Congress, the executive branch and the Judiciary have all found that Scales was wrong—if not a calculated liar—on that score. After Scales was convicted in a Federal Court in Greensboro, N.C., in April 1955, he said that "my party has never advocated force and violence." On this claim, also, he has been found incorrect—if not purposely protecting the Communist Party with lies—by all three branches of the Federal Government. So I, for one, am not willing to accept so readily his word that he has broken with the party. I am not saying that it is not true; I am only saying that I am not convinced, and for the following additional reasons:

As recently as last fall, just before Scales began serving his prison sentence, he told an interviewer from the National Guardian newspaper that "I can't say that I regret any of it. We did a lot of good things." I would ask Mr. Scales if he includes among those "good things" the teaching of how to murder with a pencil point. Does a man who says he regrets nothing that he did as a Communist for an admitted 17 years sound like an ex-Communist or even an anti-Communist as some of the bleeding hearts are describing him today?

Furthermore, the December 18, 1961, edition of the Communist-serving National Guardian newspaper published a letter from the wife of Junius Scales urging that paper's readers to send Christmas messages to her husband. Would Mrs. Scales have made such an appeal to the readers of a Communist propaganda publication if her husband had defected from and turned against the Communist Party?

And, if Scales has really broken with the party, then why has he not been attacked by the Communist press which has so vilified Whittaker Chambers, Louis Budenz, Barbara Hartle, and many others who, without a doubt, did quit the Red conspiracy? Contrast the cases of Scales and Mrs. Hartle, a highly placed Communist official who was imprisoned for violating a provision of the Smith Act. Although a reformed Communist, Mrs. Hartle had already been one of the most valuable witnesses the Government ever had for revealing the Communist Party's true character, she insisted upon serving that minimum of her 5-year sentence required to become eligible for parole. She rejected all earlier offers of assistance because she felt that to obtain a premature release might taint the testimony she had given the Government. I must say, too, that the persons who wanted to help Mrs. Hartle did not include those who are now trying to win freedom for Scales.

I would ask those mixed-up Americans who use Scales' alleged resignation as a primary argument for his release this question: Even if it is true that he ceased being a member of the Communist Party in 1957, 2 years after a jury said he had committed a felony

in belonging to that organization while knowing it advocated the overthrow of the U.S. Government by use of force and violence, why should that be used as a reason against his serving a prison sentence? I cannot think of a more dangerous precedent than one that would say, in effect, "commit a felony if you must, but if you get arrested, then denounce the felonious activity at which you have been caught. In that way you can avoid being punished for it." To make such an assertion is to turn all principles of law upside down.

The third argument for Scales' release is that the Communist Party is having the last laugh because the U.S. Government has jailed one of the party's defectors. I need not repeat the doubts I have raised that Scales is truly a defector from the Communist Party, but I will say this: Nothing associated with the Smith Act is a laughing matter to the Communists. The party recognizes this act as one of the most effective measures ever taken against subversion in the United States. There have been numerous instances when witnesses before the Committee on Un-American Activities have testified that the shock of criminal proceedings under the Smith Act brought them to their senses and caused them to get out of the party. That is why, since June 5, 1961—the date on which the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the membership clause of the Smith Act and the registration and disclosure provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950—the Communist Party has sharply stepped up its efforts to turn public opinion against both of these antisubversion laws.

No matter whether Scales is a friend or foe of the Communist Party today, there is nothing the party would like to see more than the prestige of the Smith Act lowered by his premature release from prison.

My reply to the next ill-conceived claim—that it is wrong to have an ex-Communist in prison while 10,000 active Communists are free—is a simple one, which I shall preface with two illustrations, one real and one hypothetical:

In the real instance, we have a so-called ex-Communist in prison with 10,000 active Communists outside, knowing that they are tempting a similar fate by belonging to an organization which advocates overthrowing the U.S. Government by force and violence. In the hypothetical case, we have an ex-Communist, prematurely freed from prison, being used as a symbol of encouragement to 10,000 Communists that, even if they get caught at being traitors to their country, they can expect to be dealt with most gently by their Government. I stand by the first illustration as the better one for the welfare of this Nation.

In this connection, I must say that it strikes me as strange indeed to have some of the mixed-up clemency pleaders now referring to 10,000 Communist Party members as bad and even dangerous guys, whereas in the past they have been dismissed by the same voices as nonexistent entities of the nonexistent internal menace.

A fifth reason put forth by the free-Scales crusade is that the evidence against him was obtained from paid Government informers, as if "informers" were a dirty word. My answer is this: In my 13 years of association with the Committee on Un-American Activities, I have never seen any witness against the Communist Party whose testimony was acceptable to that peculiar breed of Americans I mentioned earlier.

If a repentant former Communist testifies against the conspiracy, the peculiar breed asks, "How can you trust him? He admits he was evil or a dupe before. Who is to say that he is reliable now?"

It is indeed paradoxical that many people who consider themselves "progressive" and who are constantly trying to bring the world up to date with their advanced ideas revert, whenever a reformed Communist is concerned, to the medieval attitude that "once untrustworthy, always untrustworthy." Equally as strange is the fact that these people seem to have real compassion for a Communist Party member, but none for a repentant former member. And when a former Communist becomes an outspoken anti-Communist, their compassion for him turns into contempt.

Ex-Communists are not the only people who incur the ire of the peculiar breed. If an alert, lifelong patriotic citizen testifies against the Communist Party, the peculiar breed looks upon him as a "stool pigeon." And, worse still, if he is employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the peculiar breed attempts to smear him with the labels of "paid informer" and "professional stool pigeon."

In my judgment, informing in itself is no sin; as a matter of fact, informing when the security of this country is at stake is one of the most noble acts that a citizen can perform. Do we not look upon Paul Revere with gratitude for having informed the pioneers of this Nation that "the British are coming." Would not the United States have been fortunate if an informant—paid or not—had warned us in time to prevent the disaster that occurred at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941?

Motion Picture Director Edward Dmytryk was one of the Hollywood 10 who went to prison for contemptuous defiance of the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947. After serving his prison sentence, he reappeared before the committee as a cooperative witness in 1953, and testified that in his opinion a test of the credibility of a person claiming to be an ex-Communist Party member would be his willingness to name people, places, and circumstances surrounding such membership. While on this subject, Dmytryk made the following interesting observations:

I know there have been comments—I don't mean by the Communists but even among certain progressives and liberals—that people who talk are in effect informers. I heard that so much that I went to the dictionary and looked up the word. An informer, roughly speaking, is a man who informs against colleagues or former colleagues, who are engaged in criminal activity. I think the Communists, by using this word against people, are in effect admitting they are en-

gaged in criminal activity. I never heard of anybody informing on the Boy Scouts.

Many other former Communists have told the committee that if an allegedly ex-Communist has made a genuine break with the party, he will be willing to testify freely and completely about his activities and associations while he was a member.

Another characteristic of the peculiar breed is to twist every act of antisubversion into an attack upon civil liberties. I can only stress that the surest way for us to lose civil liberties is to renege on our obligation to defend ourselves against an enemy whose blueprint for the United States is total enslavement. I can think of nothing more pathetic than it would be to have Uncle Sam, helplessly shackled by a Communist ball and chain, saying, "But I defended our civil liberties until the very end."

Now in no way do I want to make light of civil liberties. I bow to no man when it comes to fighting for true civil liberties when they are exercised in good faith by loyal Americans. But again I must warn the peculiar breed, as I have in the past, that there are people who use civil liberties as a facade behind which they carry on the dirty work of a foreign-directed conspiracy dedicated to the proposition that the United States must be destroyed. These people make a travesty of our civil liberties when they use them as a cold war weapon for our enemies. In the final analysis, if the free world is to survive, the United States must survive. The United States cannot do so without the ability and the willingness to defend itself against all enemies, including the scoundrels of subversion.

Government witnesses in the Scales case were informants, thank God, against the most evil assault upon human dignity the world has ever known. We cannot turn back the threat of communism by accommodating or ignoring it; we must meet it head on whenever and wherever it challenges the American way of life. We should, therefore, be deeply grateful to those patriotic citizens who are willing to go into the back alleys and gutters of the Communist conspiracy to obtain and tell us what we need to know to defeat it. And we should be appreciative of those former Communists who, having seen the light, inform us of their unhappy experiences and associations so that the rest of us are better able to avoid the mistakes they made. We should particularly be grateful to these former Communists in view of the smear campaigns that are directed at them both by the Reds and that peculiar, misguided breed of Americans.

The last of the frequently heard arguments for clemency for Scales is that he was given a prison sentence as punishment for refusing to cooperate with the FBI by informing on his ex-comrades. This is perhaps the most brazen insult that could be leveled at this Congress and the Department of Justice. To me, the charge implies either that the Congress has passed legislation for the purpose of coercion or that the Justice Department, rather than using legislation as a test of whether a person abides by

the law, uses it as a weapon to make him talk. I resent the implication, regardless of against whom it may be directed.

I can only conclude from the great volume of nonsense that is being circulated by the clemency-for-Scales crusade that the peculiar breed of Americans is not so much on a mission of mercy as it is just plain galled that an anti-Communist law of the land has been upheld by the Supreme Court. Not too long ago many of these same people were upbraiding everyone who didn't subscribe completely to the law of the land in another issue. Is there no limit to the double standard employed by the peculiar breed of bleeding-heart Americans?

TRADE EXPANSION BY NEGOTIATION

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in Congress of an important textile-producing district, I have been participating as a member of the informal textile conference group, composed of Representatives whose constituencies are vitally concerned by the ruinous competition which our cotton textile producers have been facing for several years from imports.

This group was organized for united action last year. On May 2, 1961, the President responded to our urging by launching a program which involved several steps, the objective of which was to save the American textile industry.

One of these steps, which was launched in connection with the continuing conferences at Geneva on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—was to conduct negotiations with 18 other textile-producing countries, in an effort to stabilize textile imports to the United States.

After months of painstaking negotiations, an agreement was concluded on February 9, 1962, which still requires the ratification of all countries participating. Two days afterward, the U.S. delegates to the negotiations at Geneva appeared before the House textile conference group and disclosed to us the substance of the successful negotiations.

The most important feature of this, so far as cotton textiles and apparel are concerned, is that for a period of 5 years from October 1, 1962, the American cotton textile industry can have the assurance that all cotton textile and apparel imports will be no greater in any year than the level last year, which was about 6 percent of the domestic consumption of such goods.

We and our constituents to whom we reported the intended agreement were pleased with this achievement. We requested our chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] to write to the President, expressing the hope that

its effect would not be modified or diluted by administrative judgment or action, and also that the administration would now move on wool and other textile fibers.

The President replied that the rights of the United States under the Geneva arrangement will be exercised in such a manner that their force will not be modified or diluted by administrative judgment or action. He also assured us that he has requested the departments involved to implement this program for the wool, manmade fiber and silk divisions of the industry, and that nearly all of the points in the program announced May 2, 1961, apply equally to each of these.

On March 21, 1961, Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the President respectfully urging that he act under the authority vested in him by the Trade Agreements Act to establish import quotas for imports of textile mill products, garments and apparel, manmade fiber staple, filaments and filament yarn. I said in my letter to the President:

Let us have quotas on imports that are both flexible and reciprocal. Let us have import quotas without losing the concept of reciprocity in our foreign trade.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the arrangement negotiated at Geneva, we have achieved this, for the next 5 years at least, by agreement with all of the participating countries. We will share our market with them, with injury to no one, as it now appears.

It seems to me that what now has been achieved, or is about to be achieved for the cotton textile industry at the bargaining table with the representatives of many other nations, can be achieved in a similar manner for all industries which are affected or likely to be affected under any new trade program by a flood of imports.

This procedure well can be the nucleus of trade expansion programs for us and for our friends in other lands.

THE 1962 U.S. WORLD TRADE FAIR

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a joint resolution which would authorize the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the 1962 U.S. World Trade Fair, which will be held in the New York City Coliseum from May 11 to May 22, 1962. This annual fair is especially important at a time when there is an ever-increasing awareness of the need for expanding markets abroad for U.S. products.

The Sixth Annual World Trade Fair will open on May 11, 1962. Sponsored by the New York City Department of Commerce and Public Events, the fair is the largest in the Western Hemisphere and brings together peoples and ideas from more than 70 countries throughout the world.

During times of international tension, trade fairs not only provide an opportunity for business and industry to exhibit their wares but also assist in bridging the gaps between nations. Smoother and more harmonious economic relations among all areas of the globe cannot help but be a major factor in achieving permanent peace.

President Kennedy has said:

I strongly believe that trade fairs, where new products are on view and where technical experience can be exchanged, are a positive force for greater international understanding and for betterment of our lives.

For the first time the fair will have an export section devoted to goods and services of American manufacturers who wish to sell in foreign markets.

Thousands of businessmen from abroad attend and participate in this U.S. World Trade Fair each year. Thus the 1962 fair will display to these international visitors many American products designed for sale abroad.

Expansion in our export trade is of especial importance to the United States today. To quote from the President's Economic Report to Congress on January 22, 1962:

Persistent international payments deficits and gold outflows have made the balance of payments a critical problem of economic policy. We must attain a balance in our international transactions which permits us to meet heavy obligations abroad for the security and development of the free world, without continued depletion of our gold reserves or excessive accumulation of short-term dollar liabilities to foreigners. To increase our exports is a task of highest priority.

Expansion in our export trade, upon which at least 6 million U.S. jobs depend, is also vital from the standpoint of economic growth. And economic growth is necessary for the health of our domestic economy and for the fulfillment of our international commitments as leader of the free world.

The World Trade Fair is important likewise in promoting tourism in the United States. With New York City as the focal point, there are in addition many other places of interest in this part of the New World, which our international guests will undoubtedly wish to visit.

I am pleased that New York City is contributing to the implementation of our international trade policy through sponsorship of the U.S. World Trade Fair.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this joint resolution. An invitation from the President of the United States to other nations to participate will contribute greatly to the exchange of ideas, the development of our export trade, and greater international understanding.

AMENDMENT TO SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Small Business Act in such a manner that will improve the awarding and servicing of Federal contracts for Federal construction, maintenance and repair.

I feel confident that the provisions of my bill will go a long way toward strengthening the public interest in the awarding of Government construction contracts. At the same time, I feel very strongly that the principle of protecting the small businessman, to which we are all devoted, will be safeguarded.

My bill in effect would require that all contracts for construction of new Government buildings, as well as maintenance and repair of Government buildings, be awarded on the basis of competitive bidding. The historic tradition of Government contracts going to the lowest qualified bidder is as old as this Republic. I do not believe that we can afford to depart from this principle, even though other considerations might be compelling.

In recent years in our efforts to aid the small businessman, we have developed what is called a small business set-aside in Government construction. This, in my judgment, has resulted in many abuses.

In numerous instances bids for construction and repair have not gone to the lowest bidder. Also there is serious question as to the advisability of these small business set-asides because of the impact that they have had on collective bargaining in the building and construction industry. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House know, the building construction industry has a unique character in matters of labor-management relations. Because of the highly fluctuating conditions that exist in building construction, collective bargaining cannot be maintained on the basis of individual job projects. Stable labor relations are possible in this industry only because contractors and associations of contractors have been enabled by Federal statute to enter into labor agreements with the building trades unions to cover jobs that are now in progress as well as jobs that might take place in the future. In this respect, this industry is unique and the statutes which regulate it are unique. It seems to me that the small business set-aside creates exactly the same problem in its application to Government construction. It is to correct this problem that I have introduced this legislation. The nature of the building construction industry is such that the overwhelming majority of it is already performed by small businessmen who bid on and are awarded subcontracts from prime contractors. When adequate figures are provided, I am certain that they will demonstrate that a large percentage of all Government construction has always been performed by small firms with a few employees.

As well as protecting the interests of small business in Government construc-

tion, my bill, as I have said, will require that the Government will have the advantage of the lowest dollar bid on every construction job. There cannot be a monopoly in the construction industry so long as competitive bidding is insisted upon. As a matter of fact, the only protection that the public has against monopoly in construction is competitive bidding. The very nature of monopoly is fixed prices and any departure from competitive bidding in Government contracts for construction is a long step in the direction of monopoly.

TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY—
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC.
NO. 358)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith to the Congress copies of trade agreements with the European Economic Community, the United Kingdom, Norway, and Sweden, including schedules which my duly appointed representatives signed on behalf of the United States on March 5 and March 7, 1962.

Section 4(a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 requires that I report to the Congress on those instances in which I have departed from the peril point findings of the Tariff Commission. Annex A, attached to this message, lists and gives the reasons for the instances in which I decided, in the interest of concluding trade agreements advantageous to the United States during the Geneva Tariff Conference, to accord tariff concessions going below the levels found by the Tariff Commission.

At this time, when the Congress is considering a major new trade law, I wish to provide a detailed account of the circumstances in which I instructed our negotiators to make such concessions.

Most of these concessions were negotiated with the European Economic Community. When the so-called Dillon round, or, the phase for new reciprocal concessions, of the Geneva Conference opened on May 29, 1961, the EEC offered concessions following along the lines of its decision of a year earlier to reduce industrial tariffs across the board by 20 percent, a decision that was conditional on reciprocal concessions from other nations, and especially the United States. The EEC offers involved concessions affecting American exports to the EEC countries amounting, on the basis of 1958 figures, to \$846 million. Of this total, \$422 million represented exports on which the United States had asked for concessions, \$337 million being offered in the name of the United States as the principal supplier, and the remaining \$85 million in the name of third coun-

tries from which the United States would also receive substantial benefits.

It was the American negotiating objective to take advantage of the initial EEC offers and also to seek additional concessions. We were being offered tariff reductions having large potential value to our export trade. Furthermore, the emerging European community was proposing to take a first long step toward making its trade policy an outward looking one. Our interest was to assure that we obtain these new opportunities for our exporters and, in the process, that we help to mold the EEC's external trade policy along liberal lines.

Our negotiators, however, were grievously short of bargaining power. The instructions under which they were authorized to proceed fell well short of matching even the initial offers of the EEC. The EEC offer to reduce industrial common tariff rates by 20 percent directly affected U.S. trade of \$846 million (1958) and was responsive to about 60 percent of our requests to the EEC for tariff concessions. In contrast, our offers consisted of:

(a) \$41 million of offers to bind rates of duty at present levels;

(b) \$90 million of offers of duty reductions requested by the EEC (about 20 percent of total EEC requests); and

(c) \$396 million of offers involving duty reductions not requested by the EEC.

The manner in which the United States came to this negotiating position is important for an understanding of the trade agreements just concluded and for its bearing upon the new trade legislation that I have recommended to the Congress.

Prior to the Geneva Conference, the EEC had filed requests with the United States for concessions accounting for a trade volume in 1958 of \$451 million. Our interagency screening process eliminated from the original "public list" a number of articles, concessions on which would have been responsive to requests from the EEC. The trade volume involved was \$128 million. These articles were those on which tariff concessions, in the judgment of the interagency committee, might give rise to serious competitive problems for American industries.

Under section 3(a) of the Trade Agreements Act, the Tariff Commission was then required to study further the list of potential concessions approved by the interagency committee and to establish "peril points" for each article included.

The Commission found that of the concessions asked by the EEC, articles having a trade volume of \$220 million could not be made the subjects of downward tariff adjustments without causing or threatening to cause serious injury to the domestic industries concerned. Coverage of the EEC request list was thus reduced to \$103 million, less than one-fourth of the list. The Commission made the same finding on articles having a trade volume of \$113 million among items not on the EEC request list but which the interagency committee had selected in order to strengthen the U.S. negotiating position.

I believe that we must recognize that under the law the Tariff Commission was required to make hasty predictions as to future market conditions for thousands of individual articles. These predictions were necessarily superficial. Even if there had been available, and there was not, a full range of data for production, trade and prices on all these articles, the Commission's task was a highly speculative one. This was particularly true with regard to items exported from the Common Market countries. These countries are going through revolutionary changes in their trade patterns, attendant upon the development of a new internal market of unprecedented proportions. In some cases, products which were previously available for export to other countries will find their future markets within the area. In other cases, products which had not previously been exported will appear as new export specialities.

In this situation, given the tenor of the provisions under which it operated, the Commission understandably resolved any doubts by establishing peril points on the products concerned at the existing tariff level. Peril points were found at the existing rate of duty on a range of articles, for a large number of which the maintenance of existing tariffs clearly was unimportant. In many instances tariff reductions of even a few percentage points were precluded. In others peril points were found at existing duty levels for specialty commodities not competitive with domestic production. Similarly, peril points at the existing duty level were set for basket categories of many items even though the situation as between items in the category might differ markedly. Tariff reductions were precluded in cases where imports represented only a minor fraction of domestic consumption. The result was to give our delegation at Geneva a very limited bargaining package and minimum room for negotiating maneuver.

It was with many misgivings, therefore, that I had authorized our delegation in Geneva to make a counteroffer to the EEC along the lines of the outstanding instruction. This original instruction scrupulously avoided any offers of reductions below peril point findings of the Tariff Commission.

The response of the EEC was to announce a withdrawal and reconsideration of its offer. The six EEC nations indicated they were not prepared to conclude an agreement on the basis we had proposed and that they would have to withdraw the concessions that had been offered because of the gross disparity between our offers and theirs. It was clear that we were faced with a potentially irretrievable situation. If the EEC had decided to abandon its across-the-board proposal, it would have been necessary to obtain unanimity among the six member nations to maintain on an item-by-item basis some of the elements of the original offer. This was not possible. To adhere to our original position would have been to reject the EEC proposal.

The loss to our export trade from such a sequence of events would have

been substantial, for we stood to gain most from the EEC offer. Far more important would have been the long-term consequences of our action. The EEC necessarily looked to the United States, the world's greatest trading Nation, for a sufficient measure of reciprocity to enable it to carry through its provisional decision to reduce the common external tariff of the Community. If that decision had been withdrawn, the road would have been opened wide to the formation of a number of trading blocs in the free world set off from one another by high barriers to trade.

We could not permit this to happen.

Accordingly, after months of negotiation and when no other recourse was available to save the situation, I authorized our Geneva delegation to offer new concessions on a number of items at rates below peril point findings. In selecting these articles, two criteria were used: their potential value in obtaining or maintaining concessions from our negotiating partners, principally the EEC, and the extent of the competitive adjustment likely to be placed on American industry by tariff concessions.

In taking this step, we avoided the collapse of the Geneva talks and we held open the way to a future of economic cooperation, not separation, between the two common markets, the one in Western Europe, the other the United States.

Our action salvaged and revived the Geneva Conference. It did not involve serious competitive risks for American industry. We granted concessions to the EEC at rates below peril points on articles having a 1958 trade value of \$76 million. Apart from such concessions to the EEC, we also made concessions of this character to the United Kingdom on items having a trade volume of \$7 million. (Co-offers of concessions on four items, contingent upon confirmation of the same concessions to the EEC, were made to Norway and/or Sweden. These were in the amount of \$437,000.)

The total of our concessions, indeed, would not in itself have been sufficient to recover our position. The EEC, however, was acutely aware of the limitations under which the United States was negotiating. Within the Community, the forces favoring a liberal trading policy were greatly strengthened by the evidence that we were serious about bargaining down trade barriers. Once we had made our move, this phase of the negotiations proceeded expeditiously to a conclusion. That conclusion was highly advantageous to the United States.

The EEC maintained most of its across-the-board offers on industrial products. The only significant exception was in the field of chemicals, an area where, because the offers by the United States represented only \$24 million of trade, the EEC cut back its offers to the United States from \$172 million to \$93 million.

The EEC added to its initial offers concessions involving trade of \$100 million in the previously excepted agricultural chapters and another \$33 million of formerly reserved automobile parts, and on miscellaneous commodities accounting for another \$5 million of trade;

Finally, the successful conclusion of the United States-EEC negotiations opened the way for negotiations between third countries and the EEC, which had been marking time awaiting their outcome. From the resulting negotiations of others with the EEC, U.S. exports stand to receive substantial additional benefits because of our right to such concessions.

The United States thus can take satisfaction from the outcome of the Geneva negotiations. We advanced our trading interests and we maintained progress toward economic cooperation within the Western World. But these accomplishments were made, in large part, in spite of hampering features of the trade agreements law. And we had the sufferance of our major trading partners.

We cannot be expected to bargain effectively in the future under the limitations of the present law. If we are to lead, as we must, we must have the means for the exercise of leadership. The Trade Expansion Act which I have recommended to the Congress will provide these means.

In an accompanying message, I am reporting to the Congress under section 4(a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 on the disposition of the cases in which the Tariff Commission in 1960 found peril points higher than the existing rate of duty.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 7, 1962.

REPORT ON REDUCTIONS MADE AT THE 1960-62 TARIFF CONFERENCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 357)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

This report, supplementing my report on reductions made at the 1960-62 Tariff Conference in excess of peril-point findings, is further in compliance with section 4(a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

During the usual peril-point investigation of the items included in the public notice issued in connection with the negotiations, the Tariff Commission found that the peril point was higher than the present rate on nine widely varied products. The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 provides that in such instances the Tariff Commission must institute an immediate escape-clause investigation with respect to the articles involved. Accordingly, the Commission undertook the required investigations with the following results:

- (1) On baseball and softball gloves, ceramic mosaic tile, and sheet glass, the Commission recommended to me that existing duties be increased.
- (2) On tennis rackets and creeping red fescue seed, the Commission terminated the investigations without recommendation.

(3) On ultramarine blue, rolled glass, plastic raincoats, and cellulose filaments, the Commission found that increases in the duties were not necessary.

The law provides that, if the President does not negotiate the increase of duty indicated by the Commission's peril-point findings, he shall report his reasons therefore to the Congress.

This is to advise that no such increases in duty were negotiated at the 1960-62 Conference. The recitation of the Tariff Commission's further investigation of these nine cases, as above given, suggests why the negotiation of higher rates was not undertaken. In six of the nine cases the Tariff Commission, upon a fuller study of the facts than had been possible during its peril-point investigation, did not recommend an increase in duty. In the other three, I was not satisfied that all of the applicable facts had been fully canvassed in the Commission's subsequent investigations; consideration of the appropriate rate of duty was consequently still pending as of the time our negotiations at the 1960-61 Conference were being completed. I now have supplementary reports of the Tariff Commission before me. My decision on the three cases is pending.

I append a list defining more precisely the nine commodities mentioned above.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 7, 1962.

SPOTLIGHT ON MOSCOW'S IMPERIO-COLONIALISM: A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain inserts, editorials, letters, and statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, precisely a year ago this week I submitted the original measure, H. Res. 211, calling for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. As you are well aware, in the past year there has been a growing demand in this country for the creation of such a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Taken alone, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1961 is replete with supporting letters, addresses, and documented material substantiating the broad base of this popular demand. This has continued for the past 2 months. In the interval between the sessions of the 87th Congress the support for such a committee was persistent and unabated. It is now on the increase again, seeking an early favorable consideration by the Rules Committee.

It has been difficult for many of us here to explain to people back home why this vital measure was not given favorable consideration last year. A whole array of persuasive arguments and reasons has been offered to justify the for-

mation of such a sorely needed committee. We have still to hear any solid arguments against it. Regrettably, much time has been unnecessarily wasted in our striving to achieve that very objective which Ambassador Stevenson called for in the United Nations last November. And that is fixing a spotlight on Moscow's colonial empire.

STEVENSON'S U.N. LETTER ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The communication sent last August by Secretary of State Rusk to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee was a most unfortunate one. Among other things it served to delay a favorable consideration of the many resolutions submitted to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. However, the position described in the letter to which the Secretary affixed his signature has been more than adequately redressed by the text of the letter circulated by our U.N. Ambassador in the United Nations on November 25, 1961. The Ambassador's call for spotlighting world attention on Moscow's imperio-colonialism can best be answered by a continuous day-to-day operation which only a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations can satisfactorily perform. If we are serious in producing this necessary spotlight on Moscow's colonial empire, then obviously sporadic statements and disclosures will not do.

Mr. Speaker, in reconsidering this basically important proposal, I respectfully urge every Member to read carefully the unprecedented statement issued by Ambassador Stevenson. It provides the essential outlines of the detailed work that a special committee would undertake for the benefit of our people and our evolving foreign policy toward the Soviet Union. What we have been developing in addresses and writings for the past year receives substantial confirmation and blessing in this unique statement. Because of its enormous value for our wise determination of the Captive Nations Committee proposal, I request that the text of the Stevenson letter be appended at the conclusion of my remarks.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 211

To satisfy the persistent inquiries made on our proposal, I should like to resubmit here the complete text of my resolution, House Resolution 211, designed to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations:

H. RES. 211

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again

during the observance of Captive Nations Week in 1960, Moscow displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy, and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalitarian form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "non-interference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the two Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party and of whom five shall be members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to

be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1962.

Sec. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

Sec. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

SOME SALIENT REASONS FOR PASSAGE OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 211

Mr. Speaker, as indicated, many factually based arguments have been advanced in favor of the passage of House Resolution 211. In order to refresh our memories, I should like to review some of the more salient reasons here:

First. As to the pressing need for spotlighting Moscow's colonial empire, President Eisenhower, in two proclamations on Captive Nations Week, summoned the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations."

Second. Reinforcing this early expression, President Kennedy, in answer to a question raised on this subject during the presidential campaign, said:

I am, of course, in agreement with the Presidential proclamations. The captive nations should be studied intensively. If a Joint Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations is the best way to insure such popular study, I would naturally not be opposed to it.

We are modestly seeking a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Third. There is a hazardous gap in our official and private facilities as concerns this necessary task of studying systematically, objectively, and continuously all

of the captive nations, especially those in the U.S.S.R. Nowhere is there any agency, public or private, performing this essential task. Again, intermittent official statements and occasional studies on some captive nations fall desperately short of what is urgently needed.

Fourth. Passage of House Resolution 211 would be the first concrete implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. The fearful reaction of Moscow to this resolution shall never be forgotten. We can show now that we meant what we resolved then. As shown at the recent 22d Communist Party Congress, Khrushchev still nurtures a profound fear of the Captive Nations Week resolution.

Fifth. House Resolution 211 is realistically based on the aggregative concept of the captive nations—meaning those inside the U.S.S.R. as well as outside, in Asia as well as in Eastern Europe. It emphasizes the strategic importance—indeed, the primary strategic value—of all these nations for peace and also for cold and hot war purposes. Significantly, the Stevenson statement is founded on the same concept. The positive side of this concept is indivisible freedom.

Sixth. As advocates of freedom everywhere, we must always realize that the cold war is not just between Moscow's totalitarian empire and the free world, but also and essentially between the captive peoples and the imposed puppet governments. House Resolution 211 is based on this realization, and its passage would provide the necessary and prudent leverage for the captive nations in their cold war against colonial Russian domination.

Seventh. The studies, facts, and truths educed by a special committee would give the constant lie to the propagandized and overblown Russian image, particularly in the underdeveloped areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. They would bring into proper perspective the bluff and inflatedness of competing Red Chinese imperialism.

Eighth. Such a committee, engaged in continuous work based on the aggregative captive nations concept, would become a rich reservoir of new dimensions of thought, of new and fresh ideas, of solid and grounded recommendations for positive and constructive action against the traditional imperialism and colonialism of Moscow. Its meticulous studies would be the necessary fill-in for the outlines depicted in the remarkable Stevenson statement.

Ninth. The existence of such a committee would be a permanent reminder to Khrushchev that we do not now nor shall we ever write off the captive nations. This committee would give concrete evidence to the position expressed by the President in his state of the Union message:

We must never forget our hopes for the ultimate freedom and welfare of the Eastern European peoples.

And to this I would add the captive peoples of Asia.

Tenth. With the third anniversary of Captive Nations Week observance already under preparation, the House can take the lead in making this year's ob-

servance a still more successful one by creating this Special Committee on Captive Nations. The vital and basic subject of the captive nations in the aggregate perhaps deserves the resources of a joint committee and also the steadfast attention of a Cabinet officer, but we can take this first step to insure that the subject will receive adequate and continuous attention in the troublesome days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, as we scan the captive world from the Danube to the Pacific, it is quite evident that the problems of Moscow and its puppets are on the increase. The problems of Red China are the worst ever. The growth and magnitude of these problems signalize our opportunity to magnify them further by concentrating on all of the captive nations and people. This Congress has the chance to seize this opportunity in the interests of our national security, in the interest of freedom throughout the entire Red totalitarian empire.

Time, indeed, is on our side, on the side of freedom. But if we are to win, we cannot afford to waste this time. We must use it to our advantage. And one of the most beneficial uses of this time, now, is to launch a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. Speaker, in further support of the ideas underlying the proposal on a Special Committee of the Captive Nations, I ask that the following material be published in the RECORD at this point: The full text of Ambassador Stevenson's letter in the United Nations on November 25, 1961; the New York Herald Tribune report of November 28, 1961, on "United States Calls Reds' Empire Barbaric"; a congratulatory letter dated December 5, 1961, and addressed to Ambassador Stevenson by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee and also the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America; an editorial on "Let's Liquidate Biggest Colonial Empire" in the October 17, 1961, issue of the Buffalo Courier Express; and an address on "A History of Communist Aggression" in the September 15, 1961, issue of Vital Speeches of the Day.

COMMENTS BY THE U.S. DELEGATION ON THE SOVIET MEMORANDUM CIRCULATED AS DOCUMENT A-4889

The U.S. delegation regrets that the Soviet Union has been unable to resist utilizing the United Nations forum to attack a number of member states in the most outrageous and misleading terms. Under the circumstances, however, the United States now has no choice but to reply, even though we had hoped to be able to continue to keep the cold war out of the colonialism debates during the current session.

ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations was created to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. Anything which derogates from the inherent rights of mankind and of nations is a proper—and even essential—subject for study and discussion by the General Assembly. The relationship between peoples and nations which we have come to call colonialism or by its variants—neocolonialism or imperialism—can constitute a denial of the rights of the individual, and of the

principle of self-determination and as such has frequently been the subject of our deliberations.

Since the formation of our Organization, the world community has devoted much of its time, talent, and energy to the search for a solution to the more pressing colonial problems in the world. The Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, the Trusteeship Council, and the Committee on Information From Non-Self-Governing Territories have debated and made useful recommendations on a multitude of specific and general colonial problems. Other problems have arisen and have been discussed by other committees and United Nations organs.

Only a hostile propagandist could maintain that the United Nations has not done useful work in this field. Through careful, detailed study and sound recommendations on specific issues, the General Assembly and other United Nations organs have facilitated the movement of one people after another to full and untrammelled independence.

We have seen the evidence of this development in the most concrete and meaningful terms; in the form of our membership, which has now more than doubled in the short lifetime of our Organization.

This hopeful evolution should not be cited to disguise the fact that much remains to be done in the colonial and related human rights fields. There are some cases where repeated admonitions by the General Assembly have proved unavailing. A number of items in this general area have remained on our agenda from year to year to serve as a concrete indication of our failure to find solutions.

But we should not despair of our ability to find the answers to those problems. There are many difficult items on the agenda of the 16th session of the General Assembly; others will be inscribed in years to come. With patience, good will, and skill we will be able to solve them all in good time.

U.S. POSITION ON COLONIALISM

The United States is against colonialism—wherever and whenever it occurs.

As a nation, we believe that man—a physical, intellectual, and spiritual being, not an economic animal—has individual rights, divinely bestowed, limited only by the obligation to avoid infringement upon the equal rights of others.

We do not claim perfection in our own society and in our own lives, only that we seek it honestly and that the direction we take is always that of greater liberty.

We believe that justice, decency, and liberty, in an orderly society, are concepts which have raised man above the beasts of the field; to deny any person the opportunity to live under their shelter is a crime against all humanity.

Our Republic is the product of the first successful revolution against colonialism in modern times. Our people, drawn from all the nations of the world, have come to these shores in the search for freedom and opportunity in a progressive society. We have never forgotten either our origins or the nature of the world we live in.

As President Kennedy said in his inaugural address:

"We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first Revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price,

bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty.

SOVIET ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

In its frenetic effort to cover up its own dismal record in the field of colonialism and human rights, the Soviet Union has leveled two principal charges against the United States: (1) The United States is allied with colonialists and finances colonialist wars; and (2) the United States is itself a colonial power. The answer to both charges, for those willing to see the truth, is simple.

The United States is unalterably opposed to all wars, including of course colonialist wars. We are not now and we shall never become allied with any nation for the purpose of planning, financing or waging colonial wars. The military alliances we have formed with others serve no aggressive aims; they are defensive alliances created in fact as a shield and a deterrent to those who would not shrink from the use of force to impose their new brand of colonialist rule on other peoples and territories.

Secondly, we would hold no people against its will. We are prepared to take the necessary measures to consult any or all of the approximately 100,000 people whose destinies are still associated with ours any time they request it. The people of Puerto Rico are fully self-governing, as the General Assembly has found after careful examination, enjoy the status of American citizens, and are free to request a change of status at any time. The remaining territories for which the United States exercises sovereignty are in the process of becoming self-governing.

The U.S. position is that "the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation." This is the language of Bandung; it is also the language of the General Assembly in resolution 1514(XV) on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. But there is a higher authority and a more definitive formulation.

The Charter declares in effect that on every nation in possession of foreign territories, there rests the responsibility to assist the peoples of these areas "in the progressive development of their free political institutions" so that ultimately they can validly choose for themselves their permanent political status.

We have and we will continue to abide by the Charter.

THE SOVIET RECORD OF IMPERIALISM

But the question remains why the Soviet Union decided to launch such a reckless attack on those countries which oppose its drive for world conquest at this time. Every outstanding colonial question of real substance is to be found on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly. There are two major items on the agenda of the plenary alone which will make it possible to discuss all aspects of the general problem.

Why has the Soviet Union twice in the last 2 years attempted to seize the initiative on the colonial issue from the new states of Africa and Asia? Why has the Soviet Union attempted to inject East-West differences into the complicated and difficult north-south problems, thereby making it less likely that we will be able to find realistic and meaningful solutions? Why has the Soviet Union sought to distract the General Assembly from the tried and true procedures it has followed for 15 years with such marked success, substituting a war of words for detailed discussion and specific recommendations of individual territories and problems?

There are at least two answers:

First, the Soviet Union does not wish the United Nations to operate successfully in

this or any other field. The Soviet Union is fearful that the solution of outstanding colonial problems involving the West will impel the United Nations to focus attention on the situation in the vast Soviet empire.

Moreover, in the past 15 years, as the process of self-determination in the ex-colonial areas of Asia and Africa was rapidly expanding the world community of free and independent nations, the contrary process was taking place within the periphery of the Soviet Union. Wherever the influence of the Soviet armed forces could be brought to bear, independent countries, many of which had just been liberated from Hitler's terror, were absorbed and their national aspirations savagely repressed by a state bent on the eradication of the national identity of all peoples within the Soviet domain.

This indicates the second wellspring of Soviet interest in the colonial question in the United Nations. The Soviet memorandum and initiative is a diversionary move; an attempt to prevent the world organization from focusing on the serious deprivations of human rights in the Soviet world.

Many criteria have been developed over the years to determine whether or not a particular situation falls into the colonial category. Surely the key, however, is the absence of self-determination for the dependent peoples concerned.

Because the world cannot long remain half slave and half free, the United States expects the United Nations will focus its attention as carefully on the colonialism of the Soviet Union as it does on that of Portugal or any other nation. For if the Soviet Union comes to believe it can enforce a double standard in the world with complete impunity, no country in the world will be safe.

The record speaks for itself.

SELF-DETERMINATION IN THE SOVIET EMPIRE

We are told that the peoples of the Soviet Union enjoy the right of self-determination. Indeed, the Soviet regime at its inception issued a declaration of rights which proclaimed "the right of the nations of Russia to free self-determination, including the right to secede and form independent states."

How did this "right" work in practice? An independent Ukrainian Republic was recognized by the Bolsheviks in 1917, but in 1917 they established a rival Republic in Kharkov. In July 1923, with the help of the Red army, a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was established and incorporated into the U.S.S.R. In 1920, the independent Republic of Azerbaïdzhan was invaded by the Red army and a Soviet Socialist Republic was proclaimed. In the same year, the Khanate of Khiva was invaded by the Red army and a puppet Soviet People's Republic of Khorezm was established. With the conquest of Khiva, the approaches to its neighbor, the Emirata of Bokhara, were opened to the Soviet forces which invaded it in September 1920. In 1918, Armenia declared its independence from Russia and a mandate offered to the U.S. Government was refused by President Wilson. In 1920, the Soviet Army invaded, and Armenian independence, so long awaited, was snuffed out. In 1921, the Red army came to the aid of Communists rebelling against the independent state of Georgia and installed a Soviet regime.

This process inexorably continued. Characteristically, the Soviets took advantage of the turmoil and upheaval of the Second World War to continue the process of colonial subjugation at the expense of its neighbors. The Soviets' territorial aggrandizement included the Karelian Province and other parts of Finland and the eastern provinces of Poland, the Rumanian provinces of Bessarabia and Bukovina, the independent states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the

Koenigsberg area, slices of Czechoslovakia, South Sakhalin, the Kurile Islands, and Tanna Tuva.

These are outright annexations of territories whose peoples are as enamored of freedom and as fully entitled to their rights as are the people of Africa, Asia and the Americas. But there is another category of Soviet colonial territory, where neocolonialism in a form never dreamed of in other parts of the world is practiced.

SOVIET COLONIAL PRACTICES

The Soviet system of coping with disaffected populations in Soviet colonies is simple and effective, but shocking in the 20th century. During the war, the Soviets deported entire ethnic groups to the East, fearful that they would use the occasion to fight for their independence. These groups included the Volga Germans (405,000), the Crimean Tatars (259,000), the Kalmucks of the northwestern Caspian area (130,000), the Ingush (74,000). These deportations were admitted by Chairman Khrushchev in his secret speech before the Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In 1957, the Supreme Soviet, apparently in recognition of the crime committed against humanity, belatedly decreed the rehabilitation and eventual return of the remnants of some of these ethnic groups.

Even more shocking was the series of deportations undertaken by the Soviets following their ruthless subjugation of the independent nations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. In June of 1941, more than 200,000 persons were deported from the Baltic States, and the total now approaches 700,000.

As another indication of the fate of annexed ethnic groups in the Soviet Union, the case of the Kazakhs is instructive. The Moslem Kazakhs are the largest Asian nation subject to the colonial rule of Soviet Russia. In 1920, the Soviet census listed 3,968,289 Kazakhs. In 1939, their numbers had dwindled to 3,098,164. They comprised less than 30 percent of the population in what Mr. Khrushchev describes as their national republic. This suggests the human costs—to national groups—of the material advances which he claims.

Following the Second World War, whole nations and peoples were swallowed up behind the Iron Curtain in violation of agreements and without a free vote of the peoples concerned. These included Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and then Czechoslovakia in coups d'etat. The German and Korean people, divided as the result of the war, were held from unity by the failure of the Soviet Union to live up to the agreements it had signed and to permit the self-determination of these peoples through free elections. Vietnam was divided as the result of later expansionism by Communist subversion and military expansion.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF SOVIET IMPERIALISM

The disgrace, barbarity, and savagery—to cite the words used by Chairman Khrushchev—of Soviet imperialist rule is indicated by the never-ending flow of refugees from the countries made colonies by the Soviet Union. More than 12 million persons have escaped since the Second World War from the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the areas they control: Albania, Rumania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Tibet.

The greatest sustained movement of refugees in modern history continues for the 14th year out of Soviet East Germany. Since the end of the Second World War, more than 3 million Germans have fled from their homes and businesses in the Soviet-controlled zone and East Berlin in order to live and work in the free world. Despite the wall erected to hold the East German people from the freedoms they earnestly desire, East Berliners risk their lives daily to reach freedom in West Berlin.

When the Soviet imperialist regime in North Korea was established north of the 38th parallel in May 1948, another mass exodus began. Within 2 years, 1.8 million residents of the Communist zone, out of an estimated population of 9 million, migrated southward to the Republic of Korea. Within 7 months after the Communist armies of North Korea invaded the Republic of Korea, an additional 800,000 North Korean prisoners of war refused repatriation to North Korea and 25,000 Chinese soldiers also refused to go home.

Within 10 months after the partition of Vietnam, nearly a million Vietnamese had fled the Soviet-controlled north. This displacement of persons took place despite the most strenuous efforts, in violation of the Geneva Armistice Agreement, to stem the flow.

Perhaps the most dramatic instance was the flight of nearly 200,000 Hungarians after the revolt of October 1956 was crushed by Soviet troops. Since the first Communist takeover of Hungary in 1947, an additional 200,000 persons fled their homes to live and work in the West.

We are at present living through the most recent example of this general pattern. With the Chinese Communist subjugation of Tibet, more than 20,000 refugees were forced to leave their homes behind them and flee to other countries.

The right to self-determination has never been accepted for its own dependent areas by the Soviet Government. Stalin in 1923 explained that "there are instances when the right of self-determination comes into conflict with another, higher right; the right of the working class to fortify its own power. In such cases, the right of self-determination cannot be and must not serve as an obstacle to the realization of the right of the working class to its own dictatorship. The former must give way to the latter." In short, self-determination is a right which can only be upheld when the peoples concerned have not fallen under Communist domination.

On the contrary, rather than assisting the development toward greater independence and self-determination of the nations under their domination, the announced Soviet design is to eradicate all national (including linguistic) differences that exist between these diverse nationalities and the great Russian model. The Soviet Communist Party program states: "The obliteration of frontiers between the classes and development of Communist Socialist relations strengthens the Socialist uniformity of the nations and favors the development of common Communist features." The program laments, however, that "the obliteration of national features, particularly of the language differences, is a considerably longer process than the obliteration of class differences." Khrushchev, in his October 18, 1961, speech to the 22d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party left no question as to his design toward peoples dominated by the Soviet Union when he said: "It is essential that we stress the education of the masses in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and Soviet patriotism. Even the slightest vestiges of nationalism should be eradicated with uncompromising Bolshevik determination." This is the unique aspect of Soviet "colonialism"—an aspect that differentiates it from all other historical examples of one state's suppression of another's freedom. Through the total state controls of mass culture, propaganda, education and movement, the Soviets seek to wipe out forever the national characteristics that differentiate the Turk from Ukrainian, the Kazakh from the Armenian, the non-Russian from the Russian. They not only seek the eradication of differences and the suppression of freedom, but the eradication of the desire for freedom.

THE SOVIET PLAN

In view of the Soviet Union's own dark record of imperialist oppression and exploitation, Soviet professions of devotion to the welfare of the peoples of colonial or former colonial areas outside the Soviet empire are hypocritical. But more than mere hypocrisy is involved. These professions mask a sinister design insofar as the future of the colonial and newly independent peoples themselves are concerned.

Communist doctrine pretends to provide an all-embracing explanation of historical processes. It therefore discloses to those who study it the real intentions of Soviet policy.

It is Soviet doctrine that the political development of newly independent states is to proceed in two distinct phases. The first stage—as Academician Y. E. Zhukov puts it in Pravda of August 26, 1960—is one in which "the majority of the new Asian and African national states are headed by bourgeois politicians under the banner of nationalism."

At the same time, however, local Communists are instructed to prepare for the future day of direct action. In this initial period, Communists are to concentrate their efforts on infiltrating and obtaining key positions in political and social groups, especially trade-union and student movements, as well as organizing and participating in Communist-front organizations of all types.

The Soviets regard the present state of political orientation within the newly developing countries as merely a phase, one clearly undesirable and unacceptable from the long-range point of view. As Academician Zhukov phrases it: "One cannot, therefore, term Socialist those general democratic measures which to some degree are implemented in India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Iraq and other independent countries of Asia and Africa." The policies and politics of these countries, Zhukov states, are "of a democratic and not a Socialist character." At the appropriate stage, therefore, the Communist parties must come forth frankly and openly with their bid for power.

Soviet statements on colonialism are in themselves typical of the semantic perversion in Communist philosophy, by which "freedom" becomes "slavery" and "slavery" becomes "freedom." By means of this distortion of words, the Soviet Union hopes to distract attention from the real issues. But the peoples of the world can forget four fundamental facts only at their own peril:

First, the Sino-Soviet bloc today embraces the largest colonial empire which has ever existed in all history.

Second, the Communist empire is the only imperial system which is not liquidating itself, as other empires have done, but is still trying energetically to expand in all directions. With the growth of Soviet and Chinese Communist power, these expansionist efforts have now become more blatant and are now being attempted in areas outside the periphery of the bloc.

Third, the Soviet colonial system is one of the most cruel and oppressive ever devised. By the ruthless and brutal use of techniques of police control, and by the erection of artificial barriers to communication, the regimes of the Sino-Soviet bloc have harshly suppressed all movements in the direction of freedom, have instituted programs to eradicate all national identity in the people, and have held their peoples in virtual isolation from the outside world.

Finally, the Soviet colonial empire is the only modern empire in which no subject people has ever been offered any choice concerning their future and their destiny.

President Kennedy summarized it in the following words in his general debate statement at this session of the General Assembly:

"I do not ignore the remaining problems of traditional colonialism which still confront this body. Those problems will be solved, with patience, good will and determination. Within the limits of our responsibility in such matters, my country intends to be a participant, and not merely an observer, in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals. That continuing tide of self-determination, which runs so strong, has our sympathy and our support.

"But colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, of dark skies by light—or the subjugation of the poor by the rich. My nation was once a colony—and we know what colonialism means: the exploration and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whatever their continent, their class or their color.

"And that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not yet reached the Communist empire where a population far larger than that officially termed 'dependent' lives under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions—under a system which knows only one party and one belief—which suppresses free debate, free elections, free newspapers, free books and free trade unions—and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. Let us debate colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 28, 1961]

STEVENSON SPEAKS IN U.N.—UNITED STATES CALLS REDS' EMPIRE BARBARIC

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The U.N. General Assembly last night overwhelmingly approved an Asian-African resolution setting up a 17-nation committee to recommend steps for a speedy end to colonialism.

It did so after rejecting Soviet amendments that would have had the Assembly proclaim 1962 as "the year of the elimination of colonialism."

The resolution sponsored by 38 Asian-African nations and supported by the United States was approved by a vote of 97 to 4 with 4 abstentions—Britain, France, South Africa, and Spain. Portugal was listed as not participating.

The vote on the Soviet amendment was 19 in favor, 46 opposed, and 36 abstentions.

REDS' EMPIRE ASSAILED

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The United States yesterday denounced the Chinese-Russian combine as history's largest colonial empire, "one of the most cruel and oppressive ever devised."

The denunciation, contained in a statement issued by U.S. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, came as the General Assembly approached the end of a 3-week debate on colonialism.

The debate was touched off mainly by Russia's insistence on implementing a propaganda-laden declaration calling for freedom for all colonial territories. The declaration was forced through the U.N. last year.

Mr. Stevenson said in his statement that more than 12 million persons had fled "the disgrace, barbarity and savagery of Soviet imperialist rule . . . indicated by the never-ending flow of refugees from the countries made colonies by the Soviet Union."

Mr. Stevenson said Russia seized the initiative on the colonial issue in the last 2

years from countries of Africa and Asia for two reasons.

"First," he said, "the Soviet Union does not wish the United Nations to operate successfully in this or any other field. The Soviet Union is fearful that the solution of outstanding colonial problems involving the West will impel the U.N. to focus attention on the situation in the vast Soviet empire.

"Moreover, in the last 15 years, as the process of self-determination in the ex-colonial areas of Asia and Africa was rapidly expanding the world community of free and independent nations, the contrary process was taking place within the periphery of the Soviet Union.

"Despite a Bolshevik declaration of the right of self-determination for nations, including the right to secede from the Soviet Union," Mr. Stevenson said, "Russia crushed Azerbaijan, Khiva, Bokhra, and Armenia in 1920, Georgia in 1921, and the Ukraine in 1923.

"This inexorable process continued," he said.

"Characteristically, the Soviets took advantage of the turmoil and upheaval of the Second World War to continue the process of colonial subjugation at the expense of its neighbors.

"The Soviets' territorial aggrandizement included the Karelian Province and other parts of Finland and the eastern provinces of Poland, the Rumanian provinces of Bessarabia and Bukovine, the independent states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the Koenigsberg area, slices of Czechoslovakia, South Sakhalin, the Kurile Islands, and Tanna Tuva.

"Following the Second World War, whole nations and peoples were swallowed up behind the Iron Curtain in violation of agreements and without a free vote of the peoples concerned. These included Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and then Czechoslovakia in coups d'etat.

"The peoples of the world can forget four fundamental facts only at their own peril: "First, the Sino-Soviet bloc today embraces the largest colonial empire which has ever existed in all history.

"Second, the Communist empire is the only imperial system which is not liquidating itself, as other empires have done, but is still trying energetically to expand in all directions.

"Third, the Soviet colonial system is one of the most cruel and oppressive ever devised.

"Finally, the Soviet colonial empire is the only modern empire in which no subject people has ever been offered any choice concerning their future and their destiny."

DECEMBER 5, 1961.

The Honorable ADLAI STEVENSON,
U.S. Representative to the United Nations,
U.S. Delegation to the U.N., New York,
N.Y.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: Your letter of November 25, addressed to the President of the General Assembly and containing the comments of the U.S. delegation on the Soviet memorandum regarding colonialism, deserves the highest praise of every American who is responsibly concerned with the basic issues of the cold war. In behalf of this committee and its nationwide membership I take particular pride in expressing our sincerest congratulations and gratitude for your excellent exposure of Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism in Eastern Europe and Asia.

With all objectivity and on the basis of our intimate knowledge in this most vital area I can truthfully state that your stand on the fundamental issue of Moscow's imperio-colonial system is the best yet in terms of our official declarations in the United Nations. Your superbly written letter accurately depicts the first wave of Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism in the

1918-23 period and forcefully presents some of the most heinous crimes of the modern Russian totalitarians. The due emphasis you courageously place on the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. and on their invincible drive toward national independence and freedom is a decisive step in the progression of our diplomacy of truth by which we can defeat Moscow's totalitarians in the cold war. We heartily agree with you on the necessity for throwing the spotlight of world attention on Soviet Russia's imperio-colonialism. The responses which we have already received from circles here and abroad leave no doubts in our mind as to the renewed hopes and reinforced spirit that your remarkable letter inspired in behalf of the eventual liberation of all the captive nations.

In the confidence that we bespeak the thoughts and feelings of countless other Americans and with best wishes for your continued leadership in the expression of these fundamental ideas, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman.

[From the Buffalo Courier Express, Oct. 17, 1961]

LET'S LIQUIDATE BIGGEST COLONIAL EMPIRE

In a resolution submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, the Soviet Union has proposed that the U.N. set the end of next year as a deadline for the "final and unconditional liquidation of colonialism."

Now, if that resolution means what it says, it comes under the head of perfectly ducky international news. Just think of the happiness that will come to millions if the last remaining huge colonial empire, the Soviet Union, finally follows the fine example set by such enlightened great powers as Britain and France.

Such an act of repentance and reparation by Russia's ruthless imperialists and exploiters of subject peoples would represent one of the greatest reversals of bad policy in world history. It would mean a return to freedom for subjugated millions in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Moldavia, and the so-called Karelo-Finnish Soviet Republic.

Important as would be the liberation of these formerly independent nations conquered and reduced to colonial status by Russia in recent years, liquidation of colonial empires under U.N. auspices would be woefully incomplete unless it included the colonial possessions which the Soviet Union inherited when it was set up in 1917. Certainly, if the Britain of Elizabeth II follows the just policy of setting up as free nations the colonies acquired by imperial expansion under 18th and 19th century monarchs, the Russia of Nikita S. Khrushchev should feel obliged to apply the same rule to the colonies acquired by far more ruthless imperial expansion under the czars.

This would mean setting up the Ukraine as the free, strong, and proud European nation which it ought to be—and similar granting of liberty and sovereignty to Byelorussia, Georgia, and Armenia, all ancient lands, and Azerbaijan, old home of the Tartars, too. Turning to Soviet Central Asia, we find colonial possessions not so well identified historically to the Western World, but certainly with a clearer title to national sovereignty than many—if not most—of the new Asian and African nations.

These Asian possessions of the Soviet Union include Turkmenistan (better known as Turkestan), Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan (whose Uzbeks were the ruling race of central Asia from the fall of Tamerlane's empire in the 15th century to the time of Russian conquest in the 18th century), Tadzhikistan (land of the Tadzhiks, reputed descendants of the original Aryans of Turkestan, who

speak a language little different from Persian), and Kirghizia.

Their masters in the Kremlin call these colonies by the nice name of "Soviet Republics"; but their ancient peoples are under far more rigid colonial rule than the more primitive people emerging from colonial rule in the Congo and those seeking thus to emerge in other parts of Africa.

So, if the United Nations General Assembly not only adopts the Soviet Union resolution but actually tries to make it work, there will be merely a speeding up of liberation of the comparatively few Asian and African colonies still under Western rule—but there must be a breaking up of the Soviet Empire and reduction of Russia to its proper status as a sizable European nation, strong enough to defend itself but no longer able to terrorize and subjugate its neighbors.

[From Vital Speeches of the Day, Sept. 15, 1961]

A HISTORY OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION— LESSONS TO BE LEARNED

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.)

"History is bunk"—so observed one of America's foremost industrialists and a prominent maker of history. Instinctively, of course, we would brush this statement aside as, indeed, many in the past have. But, actually, this extreme observation cannot be written off entirely because, in fact, there is much bunk in the written histories of Eastern Europe and central Asia which constitute primary and basic parts of the composite history of Communist aggression. In our schools and in the public forum much of this bunk is being uncritically transmitted, and the results become clearly and appallingly evident in the bleak record of our struggle with communism.

For some quite intellectually vulnerable critics of these indispensable seminars this may be the introduction to an "extremist speech." However, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the contents of this lecture are open to any honest criticism by popular deliberation rather than by secret memorandums. Many scholars, writers, and leaders with a keen sense of history have pointed to this grave defect in the fundamental history of Communist aggression. Among them, even President Truman has said: "I have several histories of Russia, not one of which has been satisfactory. Most of them are based on ideas that were formed before the man started his book and are not based on facts."¹ In short, if our historical accounts of Russia, the base of the world Communist conspiracy, are inaccurate and even fictitious, then what can be expected of our higher formulations of thought, concept, policy, and operation regarding this global menace?

LESSONS FROM THE HISTORY OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

"Human history," said H. G. Wells, "is in essence a history of ideas." The history of Communist aggression is undoubtedly a major episode of human history and in basic essence sharpens the contrast between the ideas of national and personal freedom and those of imperialist domination and totalitarian control. History, one can say, is philosophy teaching by examples, and the examples we shall consider here are not, as Khrushchev would have it, evidence of any spurious contest between communism and capitalism but, instead, growing examples of Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism versus national self-determination and personal liberty. Needless to say, those who do not know or remember the history of Communist aggression are condemned to repeat it.

What, then, can we learn from this history? What are the general lessons to be gained from the history of Communist aggression? For one, this history provides an indispensable background for our understanding of the motives, aims, and actions of the last formidable imperialist power on earth. It, more than anything else, empirically and concretely answers the essential question, "How did this menace come to be what it is?" In effect, it answers the further crucial question, "What is the nature of the threat?" Second, the history of Communist aggression portrays a genetic development of conquest, predation, and exploitation without which pure analysis remains sterile. In this respect, our short understanding of this history explains in largest measure our persistent misconception of the Soviet Union, our gullibility for skillful Russian propaganda, and our constant reactionism to the cold war ventures of the adversary.

The third important product of a complete history of Communist aggression is a vivid appreciation of what the aggressed, the conquered, think and feel about the nature of the disease rather than what we, at a remote distance in time, place, or experience, think it to be or what the conqueror pretends it to be. For example, in 1956 the Hungarian patriot shouted, "Russkie, go home," instead of wasting his breath on the myth of communism, and earlier in the same year the Georgian patriot scrawled on the public buildings of Tiflis the positive slogan "Long live an independent Georgia," instead of the negative one "Down with communism." These and endless more teachings by example lead to the fourth benefit derived from the history of Communist aggression, namely, the insights obtained for opportunities of action, of the positive offensive, against the calculating and increasingly confident enemy.

Thus a complete and factually grounded history of Communist aggression is indispensable to our thoughts and actions in the permanent cold war staked by Moscow. It is no more necessary for our behavior and operations in any hot global war. The history of Communist aggression is the very basis of justification and confirmation of the sound warning given by the renowned Russian philosopher, Nicholas Berdyaev: "It is particularly important for Western minds to understand the national roots of Russian communism and the fact that it was Russian history which determined its limits and shaped its character. A knowledge of Marxism will not help in this."² As one views the history of Communist aggression over the years—including even the form of spiritual aggression against certain non-Russian nations prior to 1917—this sober warning sounded by one of Russia's greats in this century cannot be repeated too often.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE WHITE RUSSIAN EMPIRE

It is an open secret that we Americans are not exactly conspicuous in the areas of historical research, interpretation, and analysis. In fact, until recently, in our schools and in our daily existence we have even shown a disdain for historical inquiry and historical understanding. With regard to the reality of Communist aggression some of us woke up only when colonial Moscow took to overt means of threat and bluff against the interests of the United States following World War II. Of little concern was it to most of us that we, by private or official agency, helped substantially to build up this monster from 1917 to the present, either by commission or omission of various deeds and works. Without the indispensable aid of history we were content to form

our illusions, some of which thrive this very day, such as the illusion that the cold war began in 1947, or the illusion that Communist aggression commenced with the Russian invasion of Poland in September 1939, or the illusion that if Marx hadn't existed, we would not be threatened from the Russian source today. These and other illusions can only be permanently dissolved by grasping the major forces and patterns in the history of Communist aggression.

As Berdyaev, Struve and others solidly teach, it is impossible to arrive at such a grasp without an intensive analysis of the real, empirical background to the series of Communist aggressions in our time. The roots of these aggressions by Soviet Russia rest deep in the background presented by the White Russian Empire of the czars. Every conceivable Communist technique today has an able institutional precedent in the empire-building enterprise started by Ivan the Terrible in the 16th century; divide and conquer, conspiratorial networks, genocide, Russification, two steps forward and one backward, broken treaties, a self-assuring mystical messianism, smokescreens of totalitarian ideologies, political partitionism, the police state, inventions and distortions of history, incitement of class struggles, slave labor, anti-Semitic programs, Potemkin village tactics, peaceful coexistence—in brief, the fashioned implements of cold war gaming aimed at eventual conquest.

Lest we deceive ourselves, we are bucking up against 500 years of cumulative empire-building experience from which Lenin primarily drew on and Von Clausewitz distilled his classic cold war formulations. It is an experience based on the institutional nexus of internal totalitarian rule and external imperialism and colonialism. It is an experience masked by a succession of deceptive ideologies: the Third Rome doctrine of orthodox supremacy, racist Pan-Slavism, and materialistic communism.³ Where it serves Moscow's purposes, each of these is put into use today. For example, the Morros testimony which led to the Soble spy case in New York brought out the fact that, as Morros put it, the "Russian plot goes beyond communism. They are for Pan-Slavism on a scale more ambitious than Hitler's fanatical dreams of world conquest."⁴ And Morros operated with functionaries on the highest levels of the Kremlin conspiratorial setup.

But more immediate to the first phase in the history of Communist aggression is the period from the end of the 19th century to the downfall of the White Russian Empire. We cannot intelligibly comprehend the first wave of Soviet Russian aggression unless we come to know and appreciate the powerful force of nationalism which manifested and expressed itself in the empire during this period. Regrettably our studies of this subject are virtually nil, and as a consequence we are ill prepared today to exploit in behalf of world freedom this same force operating within the Soviet Union.

The White Russian Empire suffered from the same rebellious upsurge of patriotic nationalism that the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires did. We know of the Polish resistance and fight for national freedom in the spirit of Mickiewicz, Kosciuszko, and Pulaski, but do you know of the freedom fighters and the resistance against Russian domination elsewhere within the empire: the White Ruthenians Kalinovsky and Hrynivetski who assassinated Alexander II in 1881; the Ukrainian Shevchenko and the pervasive spirit of Mazepa in subjugated Ukraine; the jealous independence of the Don and Kuban Cossacks in the spirit of Razin and Pugachov; Chamy, the freedom star of the Caucasus and the innumerable

¹Hillman, William, "Mr. President," New York, 1952, p. 232.

²Berdyaev, Nicholas, "The Origin of Russian Communism," London, 1948, p. 7.

³Radzinski, John M., "Masks of Moscow," Illinois, 1960, p. 268.

⁴The New York Times, Aug. 13, 1957.

revolts of the North Caucasian peoples throughout the 19th century; the Muslim Congresses of 1905-06 through which Turkmen and Azerbaijani formed a religious common front against Russian colonialism?

This is only a small fraction of the history for freedom in Eastern Europe and central Asia—a history that assumes increasing meaning, value and significance in the light of current developments in Turkestan, Georgia, Idel-Ural, Ukraine and other non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. In marked measure the Russian defeat in the Russo-Japanese War was attributable to the rumblings and dissension of the subjugated non-Russian peoples, and the revolution of 1905 was in part the explosion of this force of nationalism. A decade later, in World War I, mass desertions of these non-Russian nations crippled the so-called military steamroller of the Russian Empire; and over two decades later—after a long period of ostensible Communist indoctrination—millions of these non-Russians deserted again, practically placing the platter of victory before the Germans. Even the Socialist movement in the White Russian Empire was split along national lines, such as the Armenian Socialist Party, the Tartarian Socialist Revolutionary Party, the Ukrainian Socialist Democratic Party and others.

Although we still have to uncover and make use of these facts, in the field of experience the Bolsheviks led by Lenin knew them well and used them well for their own ends. Today, this account would be condemned by Moscow as "the provocations of bourgeois nationalism"; before the collapse of the White Russian Empire it was accepted by the forthcoming heirs of the empire in the name of national self-determination. "If Finland, if Poland, if the Ukraine break away from Russia," wrote Lenin, "there is nothing bad about it. Anyone who says there is, is a chauvinist. No nation can be free if it oppresses other nations."⁵ As today in Africa and Asia, this record on national self-determination was played over and over again until the overwhelming force of non-Russian nationalism contributed heavily to the breakup of the White Russian Empire in 1917. But it wasn't too long before Lenin and the heirs of the empire proved themselves as outright chauvinists. By the established techniques of lies and deception they committed a spiritual aggression even before 1917.

You and I know of the two Russian revolutions in 1917, but how many of us are aware of the widespread non-Russian revolutions for national freedom and independence at that time? Yet the significance of these non-Russian wars of independence cannot but have profound meaning for us today. Independent national republics were established in area after area: Idel-Ural, November 12, 1917; Finland, December 6, 1917; Ukraine, January 22, 1918; Kuban Cossackia, February 16, 1918; Lithuania, February 16, 1918, followed in that year by Estonia, White Ruthenia, Don Cossackia, North Caucasia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Poland and Latvia. In Siberia, on April 4, 1920, the Democratic Republic of the Far East was founded, and in central Asia a republic was proclaimed by Turkestan on April 15, 1922. With some of these, such as Georgia, Poland, and Ukraine, formal recognition was tendered by Soviet Russia by treaty or official declaration. Yet in short time, only a few of these independent nations and states survived the first wave of Soviet Russian imperialism.

THE FIRST WAVE OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

As shown in part by the former Select House Committee on Communist Aggression, the history of Communist aggression com-

menced with the onslaught by Trotsky's Red Russian Army against most of these non-Russian republics.⁶ States like Ukraine and Georgia were subverted, conquered, and made to appear as independent Soviet republics by the end of 1920. Familiar techniques of intensive revolution, infiltration, propaganda distortion, espionage, conspiracy and planted governments were in full use before the military blow struck. One republic was picked off after another on the traditional basis of divide and conquer. By 1922 the first wars between non-Russian nations and Soviet Russia were over, and on January 31, 1924, the forcible incorporation of these many nations into the new prison house of nations was formally declared with the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. A new Red Russian Empire was now in being.

This eventful period gives us much cause for serious and sober reflection, and the fruits of this reflection may have considerable bearing on our own future and destiny. The "ifs" of history are just as much parts of reality as the "whens." If the leaders of the victorious West had understood the nationalist forces at work throughout the Russian Empire and fully supported them on the principle of national self-determination, it is reasonable to assume that communism would have only been a short echo in the arena of human history. If the Russians desired to apply its philosophy on the legitimate terrain of Russia, then, as in the similar case of Germany, nazism and non-Germans, non-Russians wouldn't go to war over it. If these newly independent non-Russian republics had formed a common front against Soviet Russian imperialism, the outcome of world developments would surely have been different. Little is it appreciated that the first smashing defeat of the imperialist forces of Soviet Russia was registered in 1920 by the Polish-Ukrainian alliance between Pilsudsky and Petlura. If their combined forces had crossed the proper borders of Russia and completely wiped out the Red Russian Army, Europe and the rest of the world would certainly have benefited from far more than a 20-year breathing period. As reflections of historical reality many of these "ifs" have pointed meaning for us today.

Foolish, indeed, is the notion that Soviet Russian aggression starts and finishes with a military war. After the conquest of any non-Russian country the aggression continues—in fact is intensified—against the institutions, the historical past, and the future hopes and aspirations of the conquered people. Finland, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia escaped the ravages of this aggression in the 1920's and 1930's. The other non-Russian nations, now parts of the Red Russian Empire under the guise of the Soviet Union, were not this fortunate. The two decades are historically replete, with deportations, slave labor, a horrible manmade famine in 1931-32, severe Russification, the Vinnitsa genocide, and extensive economic colonialism. It is in this period that Khrushchev first soaked his hands in the blood of these early and first captive peoples.⁷ It is also in this period that so-called Soviet history is punctuated with recurring uprisings, passive resistance, and the moral danger of bourgeois nationalism, as witness the uprisings of 1929-30, and the purges of 1935 and 1937 in Georgia, the revolt of the young Turkestani in the Basmachi underground during 1935-41, the armed revolts of the Azerbaijani in 1925, 1929-30, and 1933, and

the persistent opposition of the Ukrainians which caused a Russian satrap, Kossior, to blurt out in 1933 that, "Ukrainian nationalism is our chief danger." Aside from revisionism, the greatest and most enduring of crimes in the Soviet Union today is so-called bourgeois nationalism, which for us is plain national patriotism.

Most important in this first stage of Soviet Russian aggression is the dominant fact that the imperio-colonial foundation was laid for the subsequent waves of Moscow's aggressions, whether direct or indirect. History was indeed repeating itself. The cycle of Russian conquests in the 18th and 19th centuries was again in motion. Without these conquered non-Russian areas, Russia and its 100 million people in itself could only be a second or third-rate power. Ukraine by itself stands as the largest non-Russian nation both in the Soviet Union and behind the Iron Curtain. It should be noted, too, that the major economic resources in the U.S.S.R. are largely concentrated in the non-Russian nations. Turkestan, which Moscow deliberately partitioned into five artificial Central Asiatic republics and exploits severely, literally abounds in diverse natural resources. Over 110 million non-Russian captives under the alien yoke of Moscow live in the Soviet Union today. About 24 million were added in the second wave of Soviet Russian aggression in World War II.

THE SECOND WAVE OF SOVIET RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

This second wave of Soviet Russian aggression was really triggered off by Moscow signing a 10-year nonaggression treaty with Berlin on August 24, 1939. The treaty paved the way to the Nazi invasion of Poland, the outbreak of World War II followed, and the opportunity for Russian colonial expansion presented itself in Poland, Finland, and the Baltic States. The paramount feature of this massive aggression was, of course, the forced incorporation of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania into Moscow's prison house of nations. The fate met by other non-Russian nations in 1924 now, inevitably, befell these. Dependent on the fortunes of World War II, it was only a matter of time before others would meet a similar fate.

The struggle for national freedom in Eastern Europe and central Asia in the very course of World War II is a saga of invincible will and heroism still to be written for the benefit of the free world. While the war gave Soviet Russia the opportunity to extend its colonialism, it also gave the non-Russian captives an equal opportunity to strike for national freedom. Even some freedom-loving Russians saw their opportunity, too. As in World War I, mass desertions from the polyglot multinational armed forces of the U.S.S.R. were the order of the time. White Ruthenians, Cossacks, Bashkiri, Georgians, Tartars, Chechens, Ukrainians and others who were supposed to be hopelessly indoctrinated by communism deserted in the millions in the hope of fighting for the freedom of their lands. For example, let's listen to the words of a German journalist on the eastern front: "The steady flow of Ukrainian volunteers for the German forces we ignored. The millions of Ukrainians, who by themselves could have turned the scales in the east, were not only left unused, but were actually being repulsed and disillusioned."⁸

Here, in a nutshell, is the explanation of the unsurpassed political blunder in this century. The German Nazis attempted to foist their type of imperialist totalitarianism upon these non-Russian nations and in reality, fortunately for us, it cost them the war and victory. Throughout this period and, as a matter of fact, up to 1950 the na-

⁵ Lenin, V. I., "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination," New York, 1951, p. 123.

⁶ "Investigation of Communist Takeover and Occupation of the Non-Russian Nations of the U.S.S.R.," House of Representatives, 1954.

⁷ "The Crimes of Khrushchev," pt. 2, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, 1959.

⁸ Kern, Erich, "The Dance of Death," New York, 1951, pp. 103-104.

tional underground systems of Lithuania, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Turkestan and others engaged in guerrilla warfare against both the Russian and German totalitarians and later against the Russians and their colonial puppets. Our interest in guerrilla warfare today can be well satisfied by a study of the warfare waged by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army in that period.⁹ To project this further, there is abundant evidence to show that throughout the last decade this resistance and opposition of so-called bourgeois nationalism has by no means diminished in the Soviet Union. Arrests for this crime of crimes continue under Khrushchev.

As we now turn to the third wave of Soviet Russian aggression, the tragedy of having won the war but lost the peace should awaken us to some grave defects and failures of our thinking and policymaking regarding aggressive Soviet Russia. Imagine, twice in this century we have suffered this tragedy. The colossal naivete of our leaders was displayed in the Yalta agreements and other unnecessary concessions made to the greatest imperialist power on earth. Up to that time hundreds of agreements, treaties and promises had been callously broken by colonial Moscow but, for a variety of reasons, our leaders felt it could not happen to us. The roots of today's Berlin crisis go back to this period, and so does the captivity of many additional non-Russian nations. The casual reasons of ignorance and even degrees of Russophilism, then, are still at work today.¹⁰

THE THIRD WAVE OF SOVIET RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

In short, by these reasons, we, the victors of World War II and the advocates of national independence and personal freedom, literally accommodated the third wave of Soviet Russian aggression. The list of victims is as long as that of the first wave in 1920-23: In 1945, Poland, Moldavia, East Germany, multinational Yugoslavia, Outer Mongolia; 1946, Albania, Bulgaria; 1947, Hungary; 1948, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, Rumania; 1949, mainland China, where, we were told, an "agrarian revolution" was underway.

Whether by military occupation or by indirect means of the traditional Russian borderlands policy or intensive revolution, the process of aggression and the end result of conquest and domination of a people are the same. Satraps in most of these areas are Moscow bred, and although differences have arisen, as in the cases of captive Poland, satellite Yugoslavia, the junior partner, Red China, or rascal Albania, who logically can deny that the permanence of the unrepresentative regimes in any of these areas is inseparably bound up with the strength and future of their originator, Soviet Russia? Aggression by indirection was shown in Korea in 1950.

With the inner colonial ring in the Soviet Union and now the outer colonial ring in central Europe and Asia, Moscow had placed itself in position to penetrate, directly or indirectly—through its captives, junior partner, satellite or quiescent Communist groups in the world at large—any area of the free world, including ours. The world's masters in empire building continued to reap successes of indirect aggression despite the alliances, the United Nations, the horrendous presence of nuclear weapons, the maginot line of containment. By the use of Moscow's traditional argument of no interference in internal affairs, by skillful propaganda inducing fears of war, and by gaining sanctuary from us in the consolidation of their vast empire, they have a free field for

subversion, infiltration, and indirect aggression in the nontotalitarian free world.

FREE AGGRESSIVE PLAY IN THE FREE WORLD

By our basic policy of containment we accommodate colonial Moscow in a free aggressive play in the nontotalitarian free world. Tibet in 1951, North Vietnam in 1954, and Cuba in 1959 are further results of this play. What new nations will be listed into captivity in this decade: Laos, Cambodia, Iran, Iraq? These and others are real possibilities for which economic aid, military assistance, the United Nations, singly or in combination, are not the adequate answer.

To approach the adequate answer, it is necessary to keep firmly in mind this outline of the history of Communist aggression. Within the framework of this outline many other detailed acts of aggression can be included, as, for example, in Spain, Greece, Iran, Guatemala, and elsewhere. But whatever additional facts are assembled, it should be clear that as the permanent instigator of the cold war, Moscow is a constant aggressor. In less speedy times and with less advanced technology the Princes of Muscovy were also on the permanent aggressive, and with patience, skill, fraud, and deception, built an enormous and unique empire. The inheritors of that empire may use different specious arguments but employ substantially the same techniques and, above all, have the same patience and propaganda skills. As before, so now, what falls under the Iron Curtain becomes an internal affair, and what lies outside the curtain of the empire is the field for free aggressive play. What, then, can we do? Or, in other words, what profits us to know the history of Communist aggression?

THE LESSONS AND GUIDELINES OF THIS HISTORY

The "ifs" of history, as I said, are parts of our reality, for they continually haunt us into wiser and more intelligent action in the present and for the future. If, for example, our Western leaders had a vivid appreciation of the first wave of Soviet Russian aggression and the already long record of Moscow's broken agreements, with proper action in 1945 we would not today be confronted by any Berlin crisis. These "ifs" sharpen the lessons of history and contribute to its guidelines for our action in the present.

These lessons and guidelines of the history of Soviet Russian aggression are as follows:

1. The nature of the threat, or the disease, or the cancer—characterized however you will—is the impericoclonialism system of Soviet Russia. This system has historical roots in 500 years of empire building. By virtue of its materialistic basis and character, the ideology of communism—in essence a millenarian ideology of economic myth—is only a weapon of deception but more powerful than the preceding ideological weapons of orthodox supremacy and pan-Slavism. It is hardly encouraging to know that we are fighting against an ideological myth. In posing the spurious conflict between communism and capitalism Khrushchev would want us to fight the myth rather than the blood-and-flesh reality of totalitarian Russian domination. Philosophically and economically, Marxism bears as much relationship to the Red totalitarian empire as mercantilism does to our society. As one writer aptly puts it, "Like a bull in the arena, we have been concentrating on the red cloth rather than the matador behind it."¹¹

2. The paramount challenge is not in the area of comparative military power and buildup but in the determining area of propaganda, political psychology, and psychological warfare. It is in this latter area that images are built up, minds are moved, and

loyalties shifted. Bred on Pushkin, Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, and 500 years of empire building, the present Russian totalitarians are masters of the art and experts in Potemkin Village tactics, stretching from space to athletics. On the basis of all available evidence, the Gagarin story may well turn out to be the gangrene story of history, and I am convinced that Moscow cannot possibly, with any hope of victory, commit its multinational armed forces in any serious military engagement. We saw what happened in Hungary; we saw what happened in the two World Wars and the Russo-Japanese War. In comparison with these political psychological experts, we've been but puny amateurs, despite the ace cards available to us. It requires little imagination to call men to arms; it requires much in imagination and vision to exploit the weaknesses of the enemy to eventually strangle him without the horrible costs of a hot war.

3. The policy of liberation, accurately construed, is inescapable for our country if we are determined to survive as an independent nation.¹² In addition to the given quantity of armed protection, the greatest weapon we have is the captive nations of Europe and Asia. The case of Hungary proved our failure to implement this policy, not the inefficacy of the policy itself. With good reason there is nothing more frightening to Moscow than a developing concentration by us on the numerous captive non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. itself.¹³ In the U.N. debate on colonialism and imperialism last year the Canadian Prime Minister had the courage to bring up the colonialism and imperialism rampant in the Soviet Union, and Moscow went into convulsions.¹⁴ The image of Russian power could be changed overnight with this concentration on Russian colonialism and imperialism within the U.S.S.R., and with enormous impact on Asia, Africa, and Latin America.¹⁵ Many of us still haven't pondered over the question, "Why was it that Khrushchev, sitting on a pile of missiles and nuclear bombs and boasting about economic progress and the victory of communism, almost suffered apoplexy when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959?"¹⁶ The answer was the call for this concentration. Today a proposal is before the House Rules Committee to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations for the purpose of achieving this concentration. But there is no question that Russophile and other elements in our Department of State resist and oppose endeavors in this area.

4. Based on the salient features of the history of Communist aggression and also the unique development of our Nation, our course of policy and action must be in the explicit and frank terms of a universalized declaration of independence. A declaration aimed primarily at all the captive non-Russian nations in the Red totalitarian empire and also at the freedom-loving rather than just the peace-loving masses of the Russian nation.

Paradoxically enough, Marx recognized a century ago the same problem that faces us today: "They will have learned before that the idea of Russian diplomatic supremacy

⁹ Dobriansky, Lev E., "A Policy of Emancipation and Liberation of Khrushchev's Captives," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 10, pp. 13120-13121.

¹⁰ Smal-Stocki, Roman, "The Captive Nations," New York, 1960, pp. 98-101.

¹¹ "Colonialism in the Soviet Empire," Neve Zuercher Zeitung, Switzerland, Nov. 20, 1960.

¹² Barton, Paul, "Imperialism in the Soviet Union," NATO letter, June 1961 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 10, pp. 13189-13191.

¹³ Dobriansky, Lev E., "The Captive Nations Week Resolution," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 1, pp. 1032-1037.

⁹ Codo, Enrique M., "Guerrilla Warfare in the Ukraine," Military Review, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., November 1960.

¹⁰ Crocker, George N., "Roosevelt's Road to Russia," Chicago, 1939, p. 248.

¹¹ Radzinski, John M., "Masks of Moscow," p. xiii.

owes its efficiency to the imbecility and the timidity of the Western nations, and that the belief in Russia's superior military power is hardly less a delusion. There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way."

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] has served on these committees with me with great distinction, and I am happy to yield to him at this time.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate very much the very kind sentiments expressed by my very able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], to whom I believe the entire Congress and the people of the United States as well as all those freedom-loving people throughout the world owe a debt of gratitude for his introduction of this captive nations resolution. I think it is of utmost importance that a constant study of the situation behind the Iron Curtain be made and brought to the attention of the free world, and the enslaved part of the world, wherever possible.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have heard much about the evils of colonialism and imperialism. To all Americans these terms are repugnant because they symbolize the tyranny of one nation over the affairs of other nations. But the talk we have heard has been altogether too one sided. It has leveled its fire at the old colonialism, the old imperialism. This talk has demonstrated a dangerous disregard for the real danger to the peace of the world which is the new colonialism, the new imperialism of Moscow.

Turning to the new colonialism, one immediately sees under the yoke of this new imperialism a long array of politically mature and well-established nations which today are non-self-governing, which have been deprived of their free political institutions and whose representative parliamentary bodies have been destroyed. These ancient and proud nations, surely no less than the newly awakened nations of Asia and Africa, are worthy of considerate and continuing interest.

During the past 40 years this new colonialism, this new imperialism, has forcibly incorporated no less than 20 once free, democratic, and independent nations into its empire. This new imperialism seeks to accommodate the rising tide of nationalism by spiously proclaiming that these nations are independent. However, by its own definition, the new imperialism limits this independence to hollow form while the substance of the state, that is, the very life of the state and its people, is completely controlled by an alien, unwanted, and predatory power. Clearly, no nation or territory can be self-governing unless the people therein exercise complete control over the internal affairs of the nation and are undisturbed masters of their destiny. The record of the past 40 years demonstrates that the people of these non-self-governing nations will never be satisfied with national independence which is limited to meaningless forms. So long as they are deprived of the essential substance of

national independence, which is the right to govern their own affairs free from alien control or direction, they will continue to exercise the only opportunities open to them to dissent, that is, by internal revolts and freedom revolutions.

Within the past 9 years we have witnessed three outstanding expressions of violent dissent by the people of these non-self-governing nations.

In 1953 there was the mass uprising in East Germany in which the workers and peasants sought to throw off alien rule. This was followed in 1956 by the popular revolts in Poland in which all the people of Poland were in sympathy. Then, in October of 1956, the entire Hungarian nation—workers, peasants, soldiers, intellectuals, and even some of the new ruling class—rose up in a bloody revolution which resulted in the restoration for 5 historic days of national independence in substance as well as in form. All the people of the world know that it took a major military campaign by the Red army to return Hungary to the status of a non-self-governing nation. Time does not permit a full recount of the many popular uprisings which have taken place over a period of many years in Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan, the Baltic States, and in other non-Russian nations which clearly are non-self-governing. However, the implicit warning carried by these events urges us to find an honorable remedy to end the human strife and dangerous international tensions which they create.

It is time that our Government announced a policy extending our support for the right of self-determination to the captive, non-Russian nations of the present-day Russian empire. We have announced our support of the peoples of Africa in their fight for self-government, as we should by right have done. It is time that we did the same toward the ancient and honored non-Russian nations of the Russian empire, all of which have sent so many of their sons and daughters to our shores for the building of our great Nation.

It has always appeared to me to be grossly unjust that in any consideration of the colonial or dependent territory problem the burden is placed only upon the old colonialism, which has largely reconciled itself to the inevitable changes taking place in the world. The new colonialism, the new imperialism carries with it a far greater threat to the winning of the peace. Surely the non-Communist world in and of itself cannot expect to eliminate the dangerous international tensions which give rise to war. These tensions can be eliminated only by an equal amount of good will and desire for changes on the part of the ruling class of the new colonialism. That is, changes which accord with the freely expressed will of the people. The cause of peace and amity among nations requires that this burden be borne by all forms of colonialism and imperialism.

I believe that the principle of self-determination must be applied without exception to all the peoples and nations of the world. The peoples of Africa, no less than any other peoples, must be included within the meaning of this principle. I suggest that since our

Government has already pronounced our support for the application of the principle of self-determination to the peoples of Africa—the urgent need now exists to extend this principle to the captive nations held within the Russian Communist empire.

I personally favor a policy of Russia for the Russians. Such a policy would explain clearly to the peoples of the world our policy of Africa for the Africans. In this case a policy of Russia for the Russians would express to all the peoples behind the Iron Curtain in the most simple terms the meaning of our intention of self-determination for the non-Russian nations within the Russian Empire. We thereby would state that we defend the right of the Russian people to have any form of government they may desire and that their choice in the matter is their business, and the business of no one else. We would also thereby express our firm support for all the non-Russian nations within the Russian empire to, in like manner, determine their own internal systems and to govern themselves in a completely independent setting. But we must object to the Russians imposing their historic form of despotism upon other nations.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the Committee on Rules to bring to the floor the captive nations resolution introduced by the very able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], so that we may have an opportunity to vote and create this committee which, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], would do a tremendous good on behalf of the cause of justice and peace in the world.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentleman from Ohio. As always, during these debates, he is in the forefront and he speaks with great knowledge and vast experience on this important subject to our national welfare and to world peace.

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], who, from his first day in this House, has engaged in every debate on this subject dealing with this very important problem, with a background which clearly indicates that he is a learned expert.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me. I should like to join in commending the gentleman for again calling this matter to the attention of the House and for his persistent effort in getting through this Congress the resolution which would set up a special committee to deal with the problem of the captive nations. I have every reason to believe that sooner or later reason will prevail and this resolution will be adopted and the committee will be permitted to carry on this very important work.

It is a source of great disappointment to me that there should be any opposition at all to the creation of such a committee. We are recognizing throughout the world today the great dynamics of nationalism. We have adopted various programs here in this Congress to encourage the expression of nationalism in these newly emerging countries. We have denounced colonialism and our

whole foreign policy over the years has been built on the concept that we want to encourage people to be free, to find expression in their national pride and to be able to select of their own free will the type of government they want to be ruled by. And yet it would seem to me that those people who so fervently believe in the great strength of, and the great surge of nationalism in, these newly emerging countries of the world should not be so completely oblivious to the fact that we have today in these captive nations behind the Iron Curtain some 180 million people who are just as proud of their national and cultural background today as they were 15 years ago, before the Communists took over their countries.

I feel strongly that there is a tremendous potential for resolving many of the problems of the world in these nations which today are suppressed by international communism.

I think it is important for a committee of the type suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] that these concepts be given greater expression and that the people of the free world who know so much about these captive nations be given the opportunity to tell their story to the world. There is no question in my mind—and I have said it so many times and have heard the gentleman in the well of the House say this so many times, that the one single reason why Khrushchev and the Kremlin have not dared to disturb the peace of the world on any major scale is because they know that they cannot count on these 180 million people who today live in these captive nations. They know better than anyone else that at the first opportunity they would be marching against Moscow and the Kremlin and the Communist rulers, because the people have had a long history of dedication to democratic principles and the dignity of freemen.

Therefore, if we are going to recognize the great surge of nationalism throughout the world we cannot ignore the fact that right here in these captive nations behind the Iron Curtain we have the greatest potential for allies of the Western democracies in these people.

It seems to me that the gentleman's proposal which I was indeed proud to cosponsor in a resolution of my own, following his example and lead, should be brought to the House so that the House will have the opportunity to vote on it and to establish this committee to bring out the full details of the tremendous potential that now exists in these countries behind the Iron Curtain.

There are those in certain agencies of the Government who have some reservations about a committee like this. They are afraid that this committee might create false hopes among the people behind the Iron Curtain, that a committee like this might inspire these people to an untimely and ill-fated uprising. That is not the purpose of the committee at all and I do not think any sound-thinking American or any person in the free world today would encourage another blood bath in any one of these captive nations such as we saw in Hungary.

We know that the Soviet tanks and power are there and are ready to choke off any expression of freedom that these people might want to manifest at this time.

I think it is a tribute to the great wisdom and the maturity of these people behind the Iron Curtain that they are not dissipating their strength and dedication by ill-fated uprisings. There are other ways of showing the fallacy and the bankruptcy of the Communist system. The wall in East Berlin, separating East Berlin from West Berlin, certainly is the greatest indictment against the Communist ideology. I think if this committee could in a dignified manner bring forth many of the arguments that the world should know, particularly understanding the great difficulties and in the realization of the great hope that these people have, who today must by the very nature of things submit themselves to the tyranny of communism, the committee would be performing a great service to humanity. I congratulate the gentleman for calling this subject to our attention again today, and I certainly wish to assure him of my continued support to get this resolution to the floor of the House so that we can have it enacted by the Congress.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Illinois has made very fine statements on this subject on previous occasions, but none to equal or exceed the statement he has just made.

Mr. Speaker, there is no intelligent doubt that this is a major and a serious problem. There is no doubt in my mind whatsoever that if the problem is as serious as we in the House who know the problem and who have worked with it for years know and realize that it is, and from our long experience here, if this can only get the barest lipservice from an ad hoc committee or from a standing committee, if the intention is bona fide and if the purpose to be served and if the goal and the object to be attained is what it should be, if we are to turn against Soviet Russia, this charge of colonialism and imperialism which is its Achilles Heel, then it can only be done by the creation of a special committee of this House. There are many Members on both sides of the aisle with the ability, the experience, and the knowledge of this subject to make it one of the greatest weapons, the right hand of the President and of this Nation.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, once again the attention of the great House is brought to a subject of great concern to all of us who believe that we should be experiencing greater success in counteracting the aggressive colonialism of Soviet Russia. The step which we advocate will allow this very body to play a greater role in securing a long established, uncontroversial goal of American foreign policy—the independence of our fellow sovereign nations to determine their own course in the world today. That independence is being threatened in 1962 as never before. The policy and tactics of the Soviet Union clearly indicate that their goal is to bring increasing numbers of nations under the influence of communism domestically and within the bloc of nations whose foreign

policy is dictated in the Kremlin. As they succeed in this policy, the danger to the United States becomes greater than just a setback for our long-range foreign policy aims. It becomes a mortal challenge to the existence of this Nation itself.

The great scholars of the history of international affairs tell us that nations should not establish long-range goals which they are not prepared to back up with enforcing actions. They should not make international commitments which they are unwilling to fulfill. They should not overextend themselves. The lessons of history are filled with examples of nations which have fallen into this pit and have lost their position in the world.

Our country has assumed heavy responsibilities and has made far-reaching commitments in this world. We are now expected to live up to them or we shall surely suffer serious consequences in the not too distant future. One of our most demanding problems is to find methods of fulfilling our commitments and of accomplishing our goals. We have before this House a proposal which I believe could be an excellent instrument for this purpose. A Special Committee on the Captive Nations within the framework and realm of the U.S. House of Representatives could serve to advance American foreign policy on several fronts.

With immediate and continuing impact, we will, by establishing such a committee, focus a worldwide spotlight on the captive nations, their plight, the history of their domination and the conditions under which they exist today. This publicity will not only draw the attention of the American people, but will give all peoples of the world, especially those of the newly independent nations, a view of what they can anticipate if they fall into the Communist camp. Had the people of Cuba been exposed to such a view, perhaps they would not find themselves powerless to change their direction as they are today. Americans, evidence tells us, are somewhat hazy, not about the danger to the world of any extension of this type of domination, but about the more intricate nature of the domination. As we have seen so close to home, in Cuba, it is colonialism, pure and simple, and a direct result of the expressed imperialistic goals of Soviet Russia. Neither America, nor any other nation, can afford to forget this.

I think that we can expect, after these initial and valuable results of the work of such a committee, a further and continuing focus which will serve to clarify world opinion and enhance knowledge of the true nature of how the Soviet Union carries out its capture of a nation, installs its puppets, and destroys the power of the people. Too often it is not realized that this process is completely planned, that the vast majority of the people of a nation are not directly involved and that there is total disregard for the basic rights of the citizens of a prospective satellite country. To use an old proverb, usually a nation undergoing the initial stages of Soviet captivity

is unable to see the forest for the trees. Its people see only the promises made; they do not see the conditions which evolve after a short period of time.

Essentially, then, this measure represents a point of real beginning for action on the original Captive Nation Week resolution of 1959 and responds to the call for study by the people of the United States of the plight of the captive nations. The value of the proposal to all the world is great. I urge that it be brought to the floor of this House for an expression of the will of all of us in the immediate future.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to compliment my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania for his continuing determined and vigorous fight to win appropriate and effective recognition by this Congress of the captive nations of the world.

I am pleased to have joined with the gentleman from Pennsylvania as a co-sponsor in both the 86th and 87th Congresses of the resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations—my current resolution being House Resolution 215. I am delighted with the national attention being given to the objectives of these resolutions.

A highlight of my own interest in this subject was the privilege afforded me in addressing the plenary meeting of the Assembly of Captive European Nations at the Carnegie Endowment International Center in New York City, on December 11 of last year. In my remarks I told the participants of the status of the proposed resolutions. The overwhelming enthusiasm for the proposal was evidenced by the response of the delegates in attendance.

At no time in our daily pursuits should we indulge in the luxury of forgetting the plight of millions of people in Europe, Asia, and Africa whose day-to-day life is a series of futile efforts to avoid the moral strangulation of a tyrannical force.

As Americans, we tend to give little thought to such words as "freedom" or "human rights" or "liberty." These, we consider our birthrights. It is a way of life with us—like some sort of habit we have learned to accept through almost two centuries of democracy in the United States as an automatic part of our being free citizens in a free country. Too often, we are guilty of taking these cherished freedoms for granted.

Not so with people living in captive nations. To them, liberty, freedom and human rights are as real as the clothes on their backs. It is as tangible as food on the table. Yet it is a dream. It is a hope, a desire, a wish not likely to be granted by their oppressors—and understandably more valuable because it is denied to them.

It is our job, Mr. Speaker, as representatives of the greatest democracy in the world, as spokesmen of the people who have taught the meaning of the word "liberty" to the rest of the nations of the world, that we offer these captive peoples encouragement and support in their yearning for freedom.

What, indeed, are our human rights? They are, basically, the right of choice, the right of liberty not license, the right to exist as a human being with the dignity every human expects and demands.

These are rights that cannot be selfishly hoarded. They cannot be hidden in a cool place to be stored until that time we take them out, brush them off and use them arbitrarily at our convenience. If this were the case, they would become meaningless. It does no good for us to revel in the freedoms implicit in the Constitution—if day by day the menacing shadow of communism creeps over the world, blocking the light of freedom from warming the minds and thoughts of men. We cannot condone the condemnation of our fellow men who are forced to live the dull, drab, useless life of conformity and subjugation.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, freedom—like anything else worth cherishing—must be shared to be valid. If anyone on this wide, wide earth is denied freedom, we all lose a little of our own freedom. Liberty is a manmade item—it is not God given. It lasts only as long as we pay careful, diligent attention to the problems of those who are denied freedom.

Every time we see the tragic violation of human rights, every time we see human dignity and pride crushed before the ironclad weapons of totalitarianism, wickedness, and oppression we cry out in indignation. Our hearts brim with sadness at the shameful sight of any being, who professes to be human, yet displays such a callous disregard for humanity.

And we have seen it too often. We have seen it in the clash between freedom and oppression in Hungary. We saw it when the heroic people of that tiny captive nation rose up in fierce revolt in 1956. It was the most blood-thirsty, tragic episode in contemporary times and yet one of the most inspiring events in the world. Bare hands against steel may seem an effort without hope, but it will be a sign for the world to mark well. It was a sign which attested to the nature of man—a freeborn animal who will always resist unjust captivity. Mankind will always fight for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, again I wish to say it is my privilege to have joined with Mr. Flood in the sponsorship of the resolution creating a Special Captive Nations Committee. By establishing such a committee we can give heart to the captive peoples and demonstrate to them that they have not been forgotten. That is why the resolution to create a Committee on Captive Nations has so much significance. To captive peoples, submerged nationalities, oppressed minorities behind the Iron Curtain, the resolution conveys the message that their deeply felt aspirations for freedom are known to the people of the United States and are a matter of concern to the Congress of the United States.

At the same time, the resolution does something practical toward dealing with those aspirations. One of the prime functions of the committee is to make the closest and most careful study of conditions in captive nations, with par-

ticular responsibility for recommending policies by which the United States can assist these peoples, by peaceful means, to regain their freedom and independence.

Such a committee also could serve as a clearinghouse to inform the American people of the state of affairs within the Communist world and to assist the National Government in the general formulation of policy.

The consideration being given these measures by Congress is highly commendable, and I cannot urge their enactment strongly enough. The gentleman from Pennsylvania's resolution—House Resolution 211—is now before the House Rules Committee. The captive nations of the world look to us for hope and we cannot afford to let them down. For this reason I fervently urge approval of the resolution.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for reserving time to address the House on the subject of the captive European nations.

I know that Congressman Flood has been keenly interested in the plight of the people of those countries. Their tragic state, their constant aspiration for freedom and national independence, deserve our utmost consideration.

There is no better example, in my opinion, of the ruthless colonial policies of the Communist conspiracy than Soviet oppression and exploitation of the captive European nations. This Communist colonialism must end—and it should end in the restoration of freedom, national identity, and independence to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; Poland and Czechoslovakia; Hungary and Rumania; Bulgaria and Albania.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain the membership of the House is cognizant of the fact that developments in the captive European countries are of deep interest to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. A subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the able chairmanship of our good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. Kelly], is attentively studying those developments. In addition, through a series of hearings which were initiated recently, Congresswoman Kelly's subcommittee has endeavored to focus world attention on the plight of the captive nations, and to foster better understanding of the problems confronting those people.

I believe that the work of the Kelly subcommittee—which is in harmony with the objectives sought by Members taking the floor of the House today—is very important.

It is important, first of all, because the people of the captive nations want to be free, and they want us to remember that.

The bulk of those people are strongly anti-Communist. They want to work out their destinies in the framework of freedom, and of individual national identities. They do not want to be absorbed into the oppressive, totalitarian system of international communism.

Furthermore, the aspirations of the people of the captive nations are ultimately going to play an important part

in the outcome of the global struggle between communism and freedom. I am certain of this. At present, the captive nations constitute, in a sense, the Achilles' heel of the Communist monolith. Tomorrow, they may prove to be the stumbling block which will trip and bring down the entire Communist empire.

For these reasons, I applaud my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for his interest in the captive nations. I also applaud the Foreign Affairs European Subcommittee for the fine work they are doing. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I will continue to support and encourage those studies and hearings. They play an important part in our efforts to advance the cause of peace with justice and freedom in the world.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the major political realities of our era is that there are complete nations under the political and economic control of alien peoples. This fact, unjustifiable in the eyes of all enlightened freedom-loving nations, is made particularly reprehensible by the ruthless exploitation of these captive nations by their imperialistic master, the Soviet Union.

The Communists indeed become the new exploiters, far worse in their effect upon their proletariat than even the most rant-and-decadent capitalist, for instead of controlling only the economic side of man, the Communists control his totality, his economic condition, his religion, his politics, and all the other aspects of his life. They have become the feudal lords of millions of people who are no better than serfs under their rule. Moreover, they hold their empire together through a brutal suppression of rights and, when necessary, the use of their ruthless armies.

Against their will the captive nations have become part of this system. Too small to protect themselves against the colossus which attacked them after World War II, they were drawn into the web. However, it is clear from the examples of the East German riots, the Hungarian rebellion, and the Polish demonstrations that the desire for freedom is not dead behind the Iron Curtain, and that not even Soviet tyranny has been able to put out that righteous name of revolution which dwells in the heart of all oppressed peoples. For these reasons it is necessary that we in the United States help the countries of Eastern Europe in any way possible, even if it be only in giving them moral aid.

The United States has tried to be a staunch friend of freedom throughout her history. Let us hope that in this time of crisis we may do all we can to advance the cause of freedom and justice in every part of the globe.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with, and concur in, the appeal being so eloquently made here by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, that House Resolution 211, to establish a special committee on the captive nations, be presented to the House by the esteemed Members of the Rules Committee.

The fundamental purpose of the resolution in question is the creation of a special committee to devote its full time and resources to the revelation of facts and truth which we hope will ultimately and effectively influence the restoration of the God-given rights and basic freedoms of all the subjugated peoples now existing in Communist captive nations.

As we all know, in numerous and repetitive documents and agreements, the great powers of the world, including Soviet Russia, have pledged and promised the persecuted peoples of these nations, the return of their national freedom and personal liberties. The United States has consistently attempted to have these promises carried out but Russia still denies these countries the right of free elections and independent sovereignty.

If and when this House may consider and approve the subject resolution it is reasonable to feel that the rest of the free world will be more concretely convinced this Nation will never abandon her traditional principles of free government for all peoples and the captive nations themselves will be further inspired to remain adamant in their determination to reject any Communist entreaties for cooperative existence under the Soviet system.

It is reasonable to feel further that by such approving action the Communist rulers would again and emphatically be reminded that it is the sense of this Congress that no firm and lasting agreements for peace can be made while the world remains practically half free and half slave.

The fact and the truth is that the Russian Kremlin is solely responsible for the inhuman slavery being imposed upon the brave peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and all the other captive countries.

I most earnestly believe it is reasonable to expect that a special committee, by official action and reports, would focus free world attention upon the lack of sincerity, thus far, by the Kremlin leaders by their proclaiming the desire for peace and freedom in the world while they continue to hold millions of unfortunate peoples in their dictatorial hands. It would also, to my mind, be an effective counteragent to the skillful, but deceitful, propaganda of the Soviet Union.

I therefore most sincerely request the distinguished chairman and dedicated members of the House Rules Committee, in their wisdom and judgment, to permit House Resolution 211 to be debated and decided, upon its merits, by this House in accord with our established traditions and I hope that the opportunity to do so will soon be granted.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives has on innumerable occasions raised its voice in behalf of freedom and has gone on record in condemning all regimes which deny freedom to their subject peoples. Specifically this House has censured in no uncertain terms the Soviet Union's oppressive policy in East European countries by resolving to summon the

American people to observe the Captive Nations Week annually until the liberation of these nations from Communist tyranny imposed upon them by the Soviet Union. In this connection I would like to lend my wholehearted support to House Resolution 211.

This resolution, so eloquently sponsored by my honorable colleague from Pennsylvania and so widely supported by various anti-Communist organizations throughout the country, calls for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, consisting of 10 Members of this House for the purpose of undertaking "a continuous and unrelenting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war." I can conceive no better way of informing ourselves of the actual conditions prevailing in these countries, and then devising ways of aiding these peoples in their relentless struggle for freedom. I respectfully urge the adoption of House Resolution 211.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks in connection with this matter, following the conclusion of my remarks and the remarks of any other Member today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SEVENTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTURE OF REMAGEN BRIDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEIGHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1945, 17 years ago today, a small band of American armored infantry, tankers, and combat engineers came upon a bridge over the Rhine River at the little resort town of Remagen, Germany. By all rules of military warfare, the German defenders should have blown up that bridge in the face of the attacking Americans. Yet, through an incredible combination of individual human courage, teamwork and initiative, the small American spearhead captured the Remagen Bridge, thereby saving thousands of American lives and shortening the war in Europe.

Just as Lt. Col. John H. Glenn modestly shared the credit of his first orbital flight with his fellow astronauts and the scientists, technicians, and many others who helped to make this historic flight successful, so the glory of the Remagen Bridge exploit was shared among many men from many States. It was a victory for Minnesota, for Iowa, for Oklahoma, for Idaho, for Kansas, Illinois, and Michigan. It was a victory for men in

many States. In fact, when the news came into the House of Representatives of the capture of the Remagen Bridge in March of 1945, many Members from many States rose to claim glory for their State. The man who was holding the floor at the time, a beloved former colleague of ours, Brooks Hays of Arkansas, stated philosophically "I am sure there will be glory enough for all."

So today we honor the men who captured Remagen Bridge, on this the 17th anniversary of that great event.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I congratulate the gentleman who is the distinguished author of the book, "The Bridge at Remagen," and I appreciate the fact that he has taken the time to talk on this matter today.

As the gentleman knows, I had a constituent in my congressional district who was also a great hero at that time, and I am glad to take this opportunity to pay honor to all the heroic men at Remagen Bridge. As the gentleman from West Virginia has so ably pointed out in his book, what happened at Remagen Bridge probably could not have happened in any army in the world but the American Army, where our men had the courage and initiative to seize the opportunity which presented itself.

Mr. HECHLER. The gentleman, of course, was referring to Capt. George Soumas, of Perry, Iowa, who commanded the first tank company across the bridge.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to join with my colleague from Iowa in expressing my gratification to the gentleman from West Virginia for calling this event to our attention today, and also for the fine piece of work he did in writing the book about the Remagen Bridge. It is a soul-stirring story, and I wish it could be put on the bookshelf of every school library in this country. I think it is a remarkable example of American heroism. I thank the gentleman sincerely for bringing this anniversary to our attention.

Mr. HECHLER. I appreciate the gentleman's fine remarks.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I join in commending my distinguished colleague from West Virginia not only for bringing to our attention this task of heroism, but also for writing a book that should be read by every child and every adult in the United States of America.

The gentleman from West Virginia is performing a great and dedicated service here in the House, but he never will perform a service greater than that he performed when he gave to the world that great book of his, that classic of heroism.

I might say that I think that this remembering of anniversary occasions,

such as today, makes a great contribution to our country. We are a great people because of our traditions, because we have respect for those who have performed deeds of heroism and made great sacrifices that become a part and parcel of our traditions. I feel that what the gentleman from West Virginia is doing today is really a continuance of the service to his country that is characteristic of his entire life.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his kind remarks.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the book that was written by our colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER]. I believe his book, "The Bridge at Remagen," stands alongside that great book of Ernie Pyle's, "Brave Men," in paying tribute to the American fighting forces during the Second World War. I also want to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia on his interest in a strong national defense and on his participation in the Army Reserves. He is rendering a great service to his country not only as an author and a Member of Congress but also as a Reserve officer in the U.S. Army.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank my friend from Idaho.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without calling attention to the fact that the very first soldier to dash across the Remagen Bridge on that fateful day of March 7, 1945, was Sgt. Alexander Drabik, of Toledo. Along with his fellow soldiers, he covered himself with glory. It was truly an amazing episode which will always brighten the pages of American history.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio and all others who have helped to recall on this anniversary the great events which took place at Remagen Bridge. As long as our Nation rededicates itself to those sterling qualities displayed at Remagen, we will continue to be the greatest bastion of freedom in the world. I now yield back the balance of my time.

SPACE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEIGHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, I seldom pay any attention to the distortions, half-truths, untruths, and deceptions that constantly appear in the news columns and on the editorial pages of the absentee-owned Atlanta Constitution.

Correcting the Atlanta Constitution would be a job unto itself, one requiring many hours more than should be devoted to something so unimportant. Occasionally, however, I find it worthwhile to point out some of the falsehoods that this newspaper tells.

On March 6, 1962, the Atlanta Constitution willfully, deliberately, and mali-

ciously published an editorial stating that I had "voted against a big space appropriation on May 20, 1959."

The editorial was accompanied by a cartoon that implied that I was attempting to scuttle our space program.

The editorial also contained a personal attack on me. I have long since learned to ignore personal attacks aimed at me by the poison-pen artists who work for the Atlanta newspapers. They are about as ineffectual as a poodle dog yapping through a slat fence.

However, I think it worthwhile to correct the express and implied falsehood contained in the Atlanta Constitution editorial relating to my voting record in connection with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I did not on May 20, 1959—or at any other time—vote against an appropriation bill for the space agency. I have voted for each appropriation bill brought to the House of Representatives for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I shall continue to give this program my unqualified support.

I am proud of my legislative record in the field of space exploration. I had the privilege on June 2, 1958, of voting for the very first bill—H.R. 12575—that ever came before the House to provide for research into problems of flight within and outside the earth's atmosphere.

This was the legislation that created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and made possible the magnificent flights into space by Colonel Glenn, Commander Shepard, and Captain Grissom.

I voted for this legislation in the full knowledge that the program would cost this Nation many billions of dollars—and also in the knowledge that we had no guarantee that man even could master the infinite regions of outer space.

It is no exaggeration that many thoughtful Americans doubted the wisdom of Congress in approving the investment of many billions of dollars and incalculable man-hours in what sometimes was referred to as merely a project to "put a man on the moon."

However, the wisdom of Congress—and the men behind our space program—has been dramatically vindicated in the last year.

Now, the bill I voted against on May 20, 1959, was an authorization bill—not an appropriation bill. I—and more than 125 other Members of the House—had good reason to oppose this particular authorization bill because of the unusual way it was brought to the floor.

More than \$480 million was involved in the legislation; it was also the first authorization bill for the new space agency ever presented to Congress. We were "pioneering" in a new field with no precedent to help guide us. Members of the House, except the relative few who helped draft the legislation, had little knowledge of what we were being asked to consider.

It was imperative, then, that the authorization bill be open for careful and adequate debate and possible amendment. Yet, the legislation was not called up under normal procedure. It was called up under suspension-of-the-rules

procedure. This procedure limits debate to only 40 minutes—20 minutes to the side.

When Members protested the method by which the authorization bill was called up, they were told that they could get the details by reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following morning.

So the House was being asked to authorize legislation involving outer space and the eventual expenditure of billions of dollars without knowing what was involved or what was being contemplated for such a complicated and complex agency.

A bill which authorizes the Congress to appropriate \$480 million at one crack, and, in effect, puts a brandnew agency into business, cannot be debated and explained in a mere 40 minutes. I need to know what is in a bill before voting to authorize the spending of the taxpayers' money.

I voted against the authorization bill for the reasons that I have cited here. I would vote against it again under the same circumstances. I am glad to say that I have never been stampeded into voting for any legislation. Among the 129 Members who voted against the bill were the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and 3 other committee chairmen.

Now, I did vote for the appropriation bill itself when it came before the House on June 29, 1959. We were given ample time to debate this bill, and consider amendments.

The Atlanta Constitution must have known that I did not vote against "A big space appropriation" as it falsely and maliciously claimed in its editorial of March 6, 1962. The evidence indicates that this "newspaper" carefully searched my voting record before the editorial was written. They knew, I am sure, of all my votes in support of the space agency in 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961.

But nothing was said by the Atlanta Constitution of the fact that I voted for the bill creating the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on June 2, 1958, that I voted for the appropriation bill of June 29, 1959, that on February 23, 1960, I voted for a supplemental appropriation of \$23 million for the space agency, that on April 20, 1961, I voted for an appropriation of \$873 million for the agency, and that I have repeatedly voiced my unqualified support of our space program.

For example, in a newsletter sent to the Atlanta Constitution, and other papers in my district on April 23, 1961, I called upon the United States to put aside partisan politics and concentrate on attaining space supremacy. I said this:

Soviet space achievement * * * does prove that the United States has been dragging its feet in space exploration for far too many years. * * * We are today paying dearly for the misguided emphasis that we placed upon the unimportant while Russia was devoting her energies to attaining space superiority. The space race, of course, is not one that addresses itself to partisan politics. For the nation that controls space may well control earth also. I have supported every important defense measure that has come before the Congress during my more than 14 years in the House of Representatives.

I have supported our space program just as vigorously because, inescapably, it is becoming more and more tied to our military objectives.

Our national safety may depend upon it.

I have voiced similar support of our space program on many other occasions. The Atlanta newspapers know this. Since I cannot receive a fair and honest hearing in the monopolistic, left-wing Atlanta newspapers I must use this method to set the record straight in this instance—although as I said at the outset, if I undertook to refute every false statement appearing in these papers, I would have little time to attend to legislative affairs.

NEED FOR CONTINUED DAIRY SUBSIDIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, it was a sad event for the American dairy farmer when the House Agriculture Committee voted today against reporting the resolution to maintain the present level of dairy price supports at \$3.40 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk and 60.4 cents a pound for butterfat through the end of this year.

Chairman HAROLD COOLEY and Congressman LESTER JOHNSON had introduced this resolution in the House when they learned that the Secretary of Agriculture has no choice under existing law but to lower dairy price supports to 75 percent of parity on April 1, due to the excessive stocks of dairy surpluses in Government storage.

Both President Kennedy and Agriculture Secretary Freeman had appealed to Congress to take action which would prevent this serious reduction in dairy farmers' income. It is estimated if this resolution is not enacted into law it is going to cost the dairy farmers of America \$250 million in farm income between April 1 and December 1. I sincerely hope that the Senate Agriculture Committee will act on this resolution, and that it will be again brought to the House of Representatives and passed, so that our dairy farmers who are already in a desperate condition will not be subjected to a drop of 10 percent in their income starting April 1.

I might mention that this is a stopgap measure. This is just a request to attempt to maintain their income at its present level until the Congress can take action on a permanent dairy piece of legislation that is included in H.R. 10010.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope it will be unnecessary for our dairy farmers to suffer this loss of income. I hope that the Senate Agriculture Committee will act wisely and that here in the House of Representatives we will have some support on the other side of the aisle in getting this stopgap piece of legislation passed.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman for calling this to the attention of the Members of the House. I have been informed that this will cost the dairymen of Minnesota alone, approximately \$20 million in loss of income during the next year. And our dairy industry cannot afford the loss.

May I also join with the gentleman in expressing the hope this House in its wisdom will find some way of rectifying this situation.

Mr. HARDING. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota. I am sure the farmers of Minnesota cannot any more stand this loss of income than can the farmers of Idaho.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I am one who realizes there has to be some kind of change in the whole dairy program. The fact of the matter is, whether we like it or not, our citizens are consuming more and more of the vegetable oils. On the other hand, we have an increase in population and some adjustments are in order. As the gentleman has said, we do have under consideration some important dairy legislation. It seems to me it is only reasonable to give a few months extension to the existing price supports while we are working out a better program. As I understand it, all of the Members on the other side of the aisle voted against the dairy farmer this morning. I am sorry to have this become a partisan issue, because at this time we need a lot of bipartisanship in trying to work out something that is good for all the dairy farmers, whether they be Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman and to say that I am very disappointed as a member of this committee at the one-sided action taken this morning.

I want to ask a few questions. How much income will be lost to the American dairymen by the defeat of this resolution in the committee this morning? Did the gentleman state it would be approximately \$250 million?

Mr. HARDING. That is correct. Under the law, the Secretary is compelled to reduce the price support from an estimated 83 percent of parity to 75 percent of parity. I asked the Department of Agriculture to furnish me with a figure, and as near as they could tell me, it would result in a loss of \$250 million in dairy income.

Mr. BREEDING. As I understand it, the Secretary of Agriculture now must revert the price back to 75 percent of parity?

Mr. HARDING. Effective on April 1 he must.

Mr. BREEDING. Or about \$3.10 a hundred pounds for milk?

Mr. HARDING. That is correct.

Mr. BREEDING. I want to say I have a lot of respect for the dairy farmers of America. I used to be one myself. Presently my interest in agriculture lies mainly with wheat and feed grains, but I have run a dairy and I know a drop of 30 cents a hundred pounds in the price of milk is a serious drop to the dairymen of our country.

I regret the action taken by our committee this morning.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Idaho for taking this time and yielding to me on this occasion.

Mr. HARDING. I wish to thank the gentleman from Kansas for his remarks. I am sure that none of us want to see these price supports kept at this level permanently. We just want to extend them temporarily until the committee has time to act on permanent legislation.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat taken aback by the information conveyed to the House by the gentleman from Idaho, and I thank him for bringing it to the attention of the House. I do not believe that any problem area in agriculture today is facing more serious difficulty than the dairy industry. We have been faced with a decline in the consumption of dairy products for various reasons. At the same time, the dairy farmer is among those farmers having the most difficult time financially, and his burden has been further increased by the continuing decrease in the per capita consumption of dairy products. I had hoped that this Congress would be able to work out during the present session a new program for the dairy industry. But, certainly we will not be assisted, and the dairy farmer will not be assisted, by having to suffer a drop in his income during the period following April 1 when presumably we will still be attempting to find a solution and an active formula for a new milk program. I would hope that the gentleman from Idaho plans to try to get the committee to reconsider this matter, if it is within his power to do so. I certainly hope that the dairy farmer of America will note the interest of the gentleman from Idaho in his problems and perhaps call to the attention of the members of the committee who do not seem to have such sympathy with the dairy farmers' problems just what the needs of the dairy industry are today.

Mr. HARDING. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I can assure him that we will do everything possible to see that this resolution that has been requested by our President and the Secretary of Agriculture is enacted so that we might keep the level of dairy income at its present level until we are able to work out a permanent program here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman know whether anyone offered a sub-

stitute for this resolution that would have prevented this sharp decrease in the support price of dairy products on April 1?

Mr. HARDING. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Oklahoma, there were two amendments offered. In my opinion neither of them would have been satisfactory. I feel that the resolution that was requested by the Secretary of Agriculture and introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Wisconsin was the only thing that would have maintained the present price support level until the committee was able to take permanent action.

Mr. ALBERT. And this resolution was voted down?

Mr. HARDING. Unfortunately, it was.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

HEALTH INSURANCE DATA

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a most valuable compilation of data on private health insurance plans. The Health Insurance Institute has recently published its 1961 Source Book of Health Insurance Data—a digest of statistical and other factual material on the financing of health care and the allied field of medical economics.

Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out in the public hearings on H.R. 4222, there are two general approaches we can take toward financing health care: Through the private sector or through the governmental sector. I think there are times when we have to use the Government function in order to accomplish a result. But I only want to do that when I see that progress in the private sector to meet the social need or problem is not moving forward. In some cases the Government may actually impede progress in the private sector. That, as far as I am concerned, is the basic issue involved in medical care.

The data provided by the Health Insurance Institute underlines the rapid progress in the private sector. In fact, the growth of private health insurance coverage is nothing short of phenomenal. By the end of 1960 nearly 132 million Americans had some form of protection against the costs of health care—73 percent of the total civilian population. But this is not a static figure. When we look at the five major types of health insurance protection: hospital expense, surgical expense, regular medical expense, major medical expense, and loss-of-income protection, we see that there has been a tremendous growth in both total coverage and the base of protection. In the 5 year period from 1955 to 1960 the number of persons with hos-

pital expense protection grew 23 percent, the number with surgical expense protection increased 32 percent, the number with regular medical expense protection increased 58 percent, the number protected against loss of income—7 percent major medical expense coverage which was virtually nonexistent in 1950 grew 26 percent during the single year, 1960. These figures indicate that the American public is continuing to secure more adequate protection for itself against health care costs by broadening the base of its health insurance. For example, by the end of 1960, 92 percent of those insured against hospital expense were also insured against surgical expense, 66 percent insured against regular medical expense. Comparable percentages for 1950 were 71 percent with additional insurance for surgical expense, 28 percent regular medical expense.

TABLE I.—Number of people with health insurance protection in the United States, by type of coverage,¹ 1940-60
[In thousands]

End of year	Type of coverage ²				
	Hospital expense	Surgical expense	Regular medical expense	Major medical expense	Loss of income
1940.....	12,312	5,350	3,000	—	(?)
1945.....	32,068	12,890	4,713	—	(?)
1950.....	76,639	54,156	21,889	—	37,793
1951.....	85,348	64,892	27,723	—	38,035
1952.....	90,965	72,459	35,670	689	38,373
1953.....	97,303	80,982	42,684	1,220	39,571
1954.....	101,493	85,890	47,248	2,198	39,397
1955.....	107,662	91,927	55,506	5,241	39,513
1956.....	115,949	101,325	64,891	8,876	41,688
1957.....	121,432	108,931	71,813	13,262	42,939
1958.....	123,038	111,435	75,395	17,375	41,870
1959.....	127,896	116,944	82,615	21,850	42,665
1960.....	131,962	121,045	87,541	27,448	42,436

¹ Net total of people protected—eliminates duplication among persons protected by more than one kind of insuring organization or more than one insurance company policy providing the same type of coverage.

² For hospital, surgical, and regular medical expense includes coverage provided by insurance companies, Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and Medical Society-approved plans, and independent plans. For major medical expense, includes insurance companies only. For loss of income includes insurance companies, formal paid sick leave plans, and coverage through employee organizations.

³ Not available.

Source: Health Insurance Council.

The Source Book of Health Insurance Data also illustrates the growth of voluntary insuring organizations in terms of health insurance premiums received and benefit payments. In 1960 total premiums received reached a new high of \$7.5 billion. Benefit payments were at a record peak of \$5.7 billion. The 1960 benefit total represented an 82 percent increase over 1955 and more than four times the amount of benefits paid a decade earlier.

These figures represent a significant percentage of the American public's total expenses for medical care in 1960—\$19.6 billion. In fact, voluntary health insuring organizations are now paying a greater share of the public's hospital and medical bills than they did 5 years ago. Hospital expense benefits under voluntary plans accounted for 45 percent of the total hospital care bill in 1955, 57 percent in 1960. Similarly health insurance benefits covered 23 percent of physicians' expenses in 1955, 30 percent in 1960.

TABLE II.—Health insurance benefit payments in the United States by type of coverage, 1948–60

(In millions of dollars)

Year	Total, all insurers	Hospital expenses ¹	Surgical and medical expenses ¹	Loss of income ²
1948.....	772	(³)	(³)	246
1949.....	957	(³)	(³)	266
1950.....	1,299	(³)	(³)	383
1951.....	1,601	(³)	(³)	467
1952.....	2,083	1,072	537	474
1953.....	2,445	1,275	655	515
1954.....	2,720	1,445	735	540
1955.....	3,125	1,690	840	595
1956.....	3,640	1,990	955	695
1957.....	4,247	2,329	1,178	740
1958.....	4,665	2,589	1,294	782
1959.....	5,166	2,889	1,439	838
1960.....	5,688	3,250	1,599	839

¹ Includes major medical expense payments.

² Excludes accidental death and dismemberment payments.

³ Not available.

Source: Health Insurance Council and Health Insurance Association of America.

The conclusion that one draws from this data is not that we can afford to be complacent but that we are making remarkable strides in the voluntary insurance field. This is a clear record of progress that cannot be overlooked or minimized by the propagandists for the social security approach. The fact is that the public has more than doubled the percentage of its disposable personal income spent for the purchase of health insurance protection in the past decade.

I would be the first to deny that our medical care needs are being adequately met—that there is no room for further progress. In 1959 a total of 216.2 million days were lost from work by employees due to acute disability. Our Nation's productivity is seriously hampered when on an average day the number of workers off the job totals 875,000 men and women. Nor can we afford to be complacent in the face of mounting medical costs. In the past decade medical care costs have increased at a faster rate than any kind of personal expense recorded in the Consumer Price Index—56 percent from the base period of 1947–49 to 1960. Hospital room rates have shown the greatest increase with a rise of 123 percent. Hospital costs per day have risen 106 percent but increased productivity measured in terms of a reduction in the average length of a hospital stay has reduced this increase to 94 percent per hospital stay. There is much room for an expansion of medical care programs. My point, however, is that we should encourage the growth of the private sector which has already filled a major percentage of the gap, not that we should scrap this approach for the centralized governmental social security mechanism.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this booklet to my fellow Members and trust that the data it presents will contribute to an intelligent debate on the real issues involved in the financing of medical care.

SENATE INVESTIGATION OF MILITARY MUZZLING

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT] may extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Senator STROM THURMOND has been a major participant in the Senate investigation of the Defense Department policy of disallowing military personnel to freely express their views concerning the Communist threat to our country. Senator THURMOND has written an excellent article entitled, "What's Behind the Gag?" The article appeared in the January 27, 1962, issue of Human Events. I think every Member of Congress should have the opportunity to read it.

The text of the article follows:

MUZZLING OF THE MILITARY—WHAT'S BEHIND THE GAG?

(By Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A special subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee is investigating military preparedness and muzzling of military personnel. This article is an abridgement of an eight-part series of background articles prepared by Senator THURMOND.)

The purpose of the investigation is not to promote sensationalism, spotlight Communists, or persecute individuals. Rather, it is to go to the source of the policy which authorizes or is responsible for:

1. Soft-pedaling statements on communism in speeches and articles;
2. Shelving or deemphasizing troop training programs designed to acquaint military personnel with our insidious cold war enemy and his brainwashing techniques, which worked so well in the Korean war because our troops were ill prepared; and
3. Discouragement of utilization of military personnel and facilities in cold war seminars designed to give the public a better appreciation of the enemy, as authorized in a 1958 National Security Council directive.

Americans should have a full examination of these policies so they can decide whether they want present policies continued or modified. The study I have made thus far of these policies convinces me that they have a deep, underlying purpose which has not been readily apparent to the American public. This purpose is to combat the enemy in the cold war with a strategy which can be best defined as a no-win policy.

We don't propose to win the cold war because we abhor only the aggressive, totalitarian aspects of communism. In fact, we seem to be determined to join their professed revolution by adopting for ourselves and many of our allies the same social and economic measures which the Communists use as bait to attain their goal of world domination.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., administrative assistant to the President, has described experimentation in these social and economic proposals as "democratic socialism."

If the American people desire a no-win foreign policy and a domestic policy of democratic socialism, then they should have full information on such policies. Above all, they should have complete information on the enemy we face in the cold war so they can determine, as they have a right to do, whether these policies best fit the most effective prescription for maintaining our constitutional Republic and the many blessings of liberty it has been able to preserve for us through the years.

If, however, our military leaders are suppressed in their anti-Communist statements and seminars and everyone who speaks up

against communism or the hidden policy changes in this country is to be labeled a "fanatic," "extremist," or "super-patriot," then the American people will be robbed of their right to make the choice with full facts necessary to make such an important determination.

J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director and author of "Masters of Deceit," has stated: "We cannot hope to successfully meet the Communist menace unless there is a wide knowledge and understanding of its aims and designs."

Implicit in Mr. Hoover's statement is the realization that there is no wide knowledge and understanding of Communist aims and designs.

The events of recent years provide unimpeachable proof that we do not understand the nature or methods of Communists and communism. Had we understood and appreciated the menace of communism, we would not today be suffering from the losses of our blind negotiations at Yalta and Potsdam. We would never have been bamboozled into characterizing the Red Chinese as agrarian reformers. Castro, now a self-admitted Communist of some years and a sympathizer since schooldays, would not have had our support in establishing a Communist dictatorship over the Cuban people 90 miles from our shores.

If we as a people had understood communism we would never have fallen prey to subversion at the hands of Alger Hiss, the Rosenbergs, Greenglass, Fuchs, or Harry Dexter White, and the many other Communist agents who were caught—not to mention those who remain undetected and unapprehended. The postwar years in America prove beyond doubt that Americans, by and large, do not fully understand communism and its tactics in trying to achieve world domination.

The National Security Council directive of 1958 authorizing military participation in cold-war seminars was designed to help meet the need for public information on communism and its tactics. This directive has in the past year been modified by a series of Defense Department actions which give the appearance of stifling rather than advancing public information on the enemy.

In December 1960, representatives of Communist parties of 81 countries, meeting in Moscow, issued a manifesto which not only acknowledged the existence of efforts to inform the American public about communism, but directed the implementation of immediate countermeasures. Here is one quote from the manifesto:

"To effectively defend the interests of the working people, maintain peace, and realize the Socialist ideals of the working class, it is indispensable to wage a resolute struggle against anticommunism—that poisoned weapon which the bourgeoisie uses to fence off the masses from socialism."

The nature of the countermeasures was subsequently revealed in the writings of Gus Hall, secretary general of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Since the military services were, by virtue of the 1958 National Security Council directive, supporting the anti-Communist educational movements, the focus of the attack was to be on our military establishments. Indeed, Hall stated that the primary target is the military and its anti-Communist statements and seminars.

This attack was camouflaged behind a fabricated controversy over civilian versus military control of policy. Simultaneously, all groups emerging in anti-Communist educational activities, of whatever shade of responsibility, along with the military, were to be smeared as ultraright, neo-Fascists, or Birchites. The attack was launched.

In fact, articles in the Worker, official publication of the Communist Party, U.S.A., have stated that an alliance, into which even the Kennedy administration must be brought, must be forged against anti-Communists.

An editorial in the December 1961 issue of *Political Affairs*, another party publication, refers back to Gus Hall's suggested alliance and gloats over the success attained in pressuring the administration into the attack on the ultrarightists.

The same publications in this country which picked up the Worker-originated line against anti-Communists last summer have continued to blast away with innuendos and invectives which imply—some state directly—that anti-Communists constitute a graver threat to our country than do Communists.

Some of the publications following this line have been the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post* (and lately its subsidiary, *Newsweek*), the *Nation*, the *Reporter*, and the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*.

On the morning of July 21, 1961, I read articles in the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times* which reported that a secret memorandum had been sent from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to the President and the Secretary of Defense on the subject of military anti-Communist statements and seminars.

A flood of mail protesting the memorandum and other actions then began descending on Capitol Hill.

The mail continued to come by the thousands. In fact, in a 2-month period a few hundred thousand communications—mine running almost 1,000 to 1 for an investigation—were received on Capitol Hill. The tenor of the communications indicated without question that the vast majority of these people were writing spontaneously and out of a deep sense of concern. These communications from so many Americans in every State and from every segment of society constituted an effective expression of American grassroots sentiment and played an important part in finally winning approval of the investigation.

The Fulbright memorandum expressed the alarming view that rather than needing to be alerted to the cold war menace, the American people needed to be restrained in their desire "to 'hit the Communists with everything we've got,' particularly if there are more Cubas and Laos." The memorandum gave the general impression that the people could not be trusted to determine properly their country's course in the cold war.

This memorandum should be studied by every American, particularly any who still have the misapprehension that this fight is merely one of civilian control over the military. Military leaders are subject to civilian control. In fact, a recent check shows that civilians outnumber the military almost 3 to 1 in the Pentagon and related control agencies in Washington. There has never been an attempt by an officer or group of officers to seize control of this Government. I know of no officer even remotely interested in such a fantastic idea. In fact, the only place I have seen mention of this has been in the *Worker* and publications parroting the line against anticommunism.

Many indications of determination to muzzle military personnel and encumber their effectiveness against communism have been manifested in Department of Defense actions during 1961.

The sum total of all actions taken against anti-Communist statements and seminars strikes at the very heart of what should be our principal strength in the war against the godless ideology of communism. This strength is the morale of both the armed services personnel and the American civilian public. Without good morale, the will to win, and the belief in our ability to win, the protracted conflict with communism cannot be resolved in our favor.

No one gets any pleasure out of recalling successes scored by the Communists in Korea by brainwashing POW's and promoting "bug-

outs" by GI's who had not been sufficiently impressed with the nature of the enemy, American ideals, or why it was necessary to fight in that far-off, rough and cold terrain.

There is no indication that any serious effort has been made to impress commanders at all levels with either the necessity for maintaining T.I. & E. programs, or with the needs of service personnel for training in our system of government and the nature of the Communist menace. There has been little, if any, emphasis on the most imperative need—a strong sense of individual responsibility.

My studies have revealed only slight efforts to acquaint troop commanders with the materials and devices available for use in conducting T.I. & E. programs. From a review of T.I. & E. materials made available, one cannot escape the conclusion that the Defense Department has been reticent to facing up to the problems of brainwashing techniques. In fact, it is easy to conclude that the word "brainwashing" is consciously avoided.

In a recent speech, Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie gave good evidence of the job that needs to be done on T.I. & E. programs with these remarks:

"Here are some statistics about the present day enlisted recruits revealed by a recent Marine Corps survey, a survey of the highly motivated type of young American who volunteers for the rigors of Marine Corps recruit training. Only half of the boys recruited can make a rational explanation of the meaning of the Fourth of July. Only a pitiful small number of them can make an intelligent discrimination among the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence. In fact, only one out of three knows which came first, the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. Only 1 in 10 can give a reasonable comparison between the basic characteristics of communism and the opposite concepts of our free system of government."

With Defense Department leadership giving the impression of discouraging efforts to alert the American public and troops on the many facets of the Communist threat it is easy to understand why our T.I. & E. programs are mostly impotent and are rarely pursued by commanders with vigor and effectiveness.

It is essential that foreign policy not be so broadly interpreted in applying censorship as to prevent statements being made on any subject which, regardless of by whom made, might conceivably influence a person in his thinking on foreign peoples or nations or our relations with them. Such an interpretation leads to a complete gag.

During the past year there has developed an increasingly strict pattern of censorship of all statements of military personnel. The following are examples of the type statement deleted from proposed speeches:

"Communist conspiracy directed toward absolute domination of the world."

"Soviet infiltration menacing this Nation and extending throughout far corners of the globe."

"The steady advance of communism."

"The Communist challenge."

"Insidious ideology of world communism."

"Nothing has happened to indicate that the goals of international communism have changed."

This pattern of censoring out penetrating phrases on communism is relatively consistent, wherever such material is submitted and is performed usually by State Department personnel. There appears to be complete consistency in the deletion of any use of the words "victory" or "war."

The Defense Department's answer to criticism of such censorship is that extra care is needed during periods of "sensitive negotiations." In a speech on September 18, I analyzed censored items and dates and re-

futed this contention by showing that such items were deleted fairly consistently during the year, particularly when we were not negotiating with the Communists.

Such a policy should be exposed and changed. It reflects an abysmal ignorance of communism and Communist methods. Communist tactics do not change or react according to the words spoken by our own people or leaders.

If it suits the Communist purpose to negotiate—and they have been much more successful in this area than we have—they will negotiate even if we spit in their faces. If they do not intend to negotiate, no sweet words from Western officialdom will induce them to negotiate. The Communists react only to raw power, never to words.

The instances of censorship of speeches and service journals, inadequacies of troop information and education programs, and discouragements of cold war seminars, if examined in the context of the single, specific instance, might in many cases appear to have no far-reaching consequences. The sum total of all these, however, builds up to a definite pattern. When considered in its entirety, this matter goes to the heart of our ability to survive as a nation against the threat of international communism.

Make no mistake, it is communism which is our enemy. Its aim is domination of the world under a totalitarian rule which will seek to reduce all people to one level, pegged to the lowest common denominator.

In less than half a century a small band of dedicated Communists has extended its control from Petrograd to many parts of the world. They now control 26 percent of the world's land mass and 36 percent of the world's population. Since World War II, 15 countries and 900,000 people have gone behind the Iron Curtain. This enemy is in dead earnest. How much more proof do we need?

If Mr. Khrushchev were asked what has helped the Communists most in their thus far successful drive to communize the world, no doubt he would answer: "American apathy, lack of knowledge of our operations and goals, and—above all—refusal to believe that we mean what we have said and written for years."

World communism has made its biggest gains through use of the powerful art of psychological warfare and propaganda. Unfortunately, many Americans have bought the Soviet line that since we can't beat them we should join their world revolution. Too many times we have fallen for the Red line and later translated it into our own national policies.

In a recent appearance on "Meet the Press," former CIA Director Allen Dulles warned that too often the Soviet line had been picked up and parroted by various of the news media in this country. Mr. Dulles, by the way, is no conservative, no extreme right-winger or fanatic.

Censorship and suppression behind a smokescreen of civilian control shield policies on which the American people have too few facts. If these policies—among them the no-win strategy and "democratic socialism"—cannot stand the spotlight of public attention and discussion, then they should be rejected.

The investigation into muzzling our military leaders will be a good one which will serve the best interests of the American people. As the assigned advocate on the subcommittee in this investigation, I shall be fair, factual but unrelenting. I hope every American will follow these hearings with interest and objectivity.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This montage of newspaper and magazine headlines was prepared by Senator THURMOND to show the transfer of Red ideas from the Communist press to non-Communist publications. The large headline from the *Worker* was used over an

article by Gus Hall, secretary general of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in which he urged an alliance against what he called the threat of the ultraright and the military-big business complex. The articles in the top and bottom right—from the Washington Post and New York Times, respectively—attracted Senator THURMOND's attention to the Fulbright memorandum.)

From the Worker, July 16, 1961: "For People's Unity Against Big Business Reaction and War Danger—The Ultraright, Kennedy, and Role of the Progressives."

From the Washington Post, July 21, 1961: "Study Asserts Military Rightists Raise Obstacles to Kennedy Program."

From the Nation Juggernaut: "The Welfare State," by Fred J. Cook.

From the Reporter: "Revivalism on the Far Right," by Philip Norton.

From the Worker, August 13, 1961: "The Kennedy Forces and the Ultraright Threat," by William Weinstone.

"Birchites Finding Allies in Military," by Marquis Childs.

"Rightwing Officers Worrying Pentagon," by Cabell Phillips.

From Political Affairs, December 1961: "The President and the Rightists."

STATE PROVES THE NECESSITY OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the past year members of my party have joined with their colleagues of the majority party to advocate and advance the formation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. In this bipartisan effort we have assembled all the compelling arguments and reasons justifying such a committee. I am happy to note that early in this constructive campaign the Republican congressional policy committee went on record favoring the establishment of this committee.

In urging at this time that the Rules Committee take decisive action on this necessary measure, it is not my intention to review all the arguments and reasons which have been given in support of a special committee. However, I do wish to use this occasion for the purpose of offering further evidence substantiating our position. Indeed, the Department of State has furnished us with this interesting evidence. As a matter of fact, the evidence constitutes empirical proof of one of our outstanding reasons for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; namely, that among other things such a committee would be of invaluable service to our own executive departments. By this evidence State proves the necessity of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

THE FIRST RUSK LETTER

Mr. Speaker, since this evidence has circulated among interested groups in this country, I should like to offer them here to be printed in the RECORD for pub-

lic reading and examination. I believe countless Americans will be stunned by the contents of the Secretary of State's first letter to the House Rules Committee, opposing action last August on the special committee proposal. Dated August 22, 1961, the letter shows all the marks of deficient knowledge and understanding of the Soviet Union, not to mention our interest in cold war victory.

I request that this letter be printed at this point of my remarks and followed by my statement regarding it last October and by the analysis made of it over the "Manion Forum" in its weekly broadcast No. 372 last November 12. A careful reading of this material by our colleagues and by our citizens will be enough to convince them of the necessity for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations:

AUGUST 22, 1961.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate the opportunity offered in your letter of August 9 to comment upon the proposed establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations as called for in House Resolution 211.

I have carefully considered the possible role of such a committee in our continuing efforts to deal with the major foreign policy problem represented by the Soviet dominated areas. I have reluctantly concluded that the formation of such a committee would not be helpful.

As the U.S. Government seeks to deal with the threat posed by recent Soviet actions concerning Berlin, it is of utmost importance that we approach any consultations with our allies or negotiations with the Soviet Union in an atmosphere which best lends itself to an acceptable settlement. In this context, I believe the establishment of such a committee at this time would likely be a source of contention and might be taken as a pretext for actions by the Soviet Union which would interfere with the resolution of the present crisis concerning Berlin.

The position of the U.S. Government in refusing to accept the status quo of Soviet domination over other countries within the Soviet bloc as a permanent condition remains clear and firm. This Government has consistently recognized and upheld the right of these peoples to national independence, to governments of their own free choosing, and to the enjoyment of fundamental human rights and freedoms. The interest of the U.S. Government in their cause is deep and abiding and the Department of State has given constant attention over the years to policies and courses of action designed to convey this interest to the peoples of these areas.

The study of the problem of these peoples has long been a major preoccupation of both governmental and nongovernmental experts, and of the regularly constituted and other committees of the Congress.

The President and I have both expressed the conviction that a final settlement of the problem of Berlin, of Germany and of central Europe must take account of the right of self-determination of the peoples concerned. However, the U.S. Government's position is weakened by any action which confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations with the status of areas, such as the Ukraine, Armenia or Georgia, which are traditional parts of the Soviet Union. Reference to these latter areas places the U.S. Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of a historical state.

Let me emphasize that our judgment concerning House Resolution 211 all is based upon thoughtful consideration in the light

of the complex situation which we face and will continue to face in the coming months.

I hope that you will let me know if I can be of further help to you.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, REPUBLICAN, OF ILLINOIS, OCTOBER 1, 1961

Today I charged the State Department with obvious indifference to the internal problems within the Soviet Union, coupled with a complete lack of imagination in the conduct of foreign affairs in the present cold war crisis.

I issued this statement of disappointment at the failure of the House Rules Committee to clear a resolution creating a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

By way of explanation, this special committee would have been a bipartisan House activity since resolutions in almost equal numbers had been introduced by members of both parties. As early as May 23, 1961, the House Republican policy committee had endorsed the creation of this committee, the Republican members on the Rules Committee had urged its adoption, but the proposed establishment was impeded as a direct result of a letter from Secretary of State Dean Rusk to Chairman HOWARD SMITH of the Rules Committee.

May I refer to the Rules Committee struggle early in the year which supposedly would permit resolutions of this nature to reach the floor of the House for consideration by the Members. I believe the House would have overwhelmingly approved the creation of a Special Captive Nations Committee. The public demand for activity in this field was evidenced by the nationwide observances of Captive Nations Week last July.

As the United Nations enters its most controversial session and the Soviet Union, their Red Chinese allies, Castro's Cuba, and other Red nations continue their offensive to keep the West off balance, it is almost unbelievable that our State Department should be so lacking in perception as to be blind to the tremendous virtues and potential of this House committee. I have urged on numerous occasions that the creation of this Special House Committee on Captive Nations would be of extreme value to the State Department and to our United Nations representative in dealing with Red propaganda concerning Western imperialism, pointing out the true facts that imperialism and colonialism as practiced by the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe far exceed any abuses which could be charged to Western nations.

Now, more than ever we need an imaginative, vigorous, long-range foreign policy, and the facts are obvious that the satellite nations of Eastern Europe and the captive peoples in previously free countries now enslaved by the Soviet Union, represent a tremendous source of weakness that should be effectively generated by the West.

All peoples previously free—the satellite nations, the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union, and the Russian people themselves—are no exception. The nationalistic spirit of self-determination, culture, and heritage of these peoples must be continually marshaled and encouraged if we are ever to have a world of peace and freedom.

[From the Manion Forum, Nov. 12, 1961]

CAPTIVE NATIONS—MOSCOW'S ACHILLES HEEL

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

DEAN MANION. Time and again, over this microphone you have heard me and others repeat a simple statement of fact; namely, that our best allies in our war against the Soviet Communist conquest are the people of the captive nations now enslaved by Moscow.

The hatred of these people for the slave-masters of the Kremlin and their burning desire to be free from Communist tyranny is the best weapon in our arsenal, but our leaders continue to refuse to use it.

Rather than employ this weapon, which could give us complete and final victory without the hot, worldwide atomic holocaust that the pacifists are always warning us about, we steadily retreat and bankrupt ourselves in senseless, self-defeating efforts to buy off the Kremlin's Communist lieutenants in the Congo, Yugoslavia, and Indonesia. Nevertheless, our State Department to the contrary, Congress by unanimous resolution has made our interests in the freedom of the captive nations a matter of official concern. And, responsive to Congress, the President has proclaimed an official Captive Nations Week in this country every year since 1959. Why doesn't our State Department enforce our captive nations resolution?

The chief author of that resolution, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, is here to discuss this vitally important question. My guest is neither a Congressman nor a politician. He is a scholar, a professor at Georgetown University, and the chairman of a group of prominent patriots known as the National Captive Nations Committee, 1000 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Dobriansky, tell us why you believe so sincerely that the full implementation of the captive nations resolution could help us win the war with communism.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Dean Manion, let me stress at the outset that, for me, this is not just a matter of sincere belief based on good emotional sentiment or humanitarian inclination. Primarily, it is one of deep intellectual conviction and certitude supported by overwhelming evidence, by facts, figures and tested principles.

The complete and documented story behind this resolution and how it became Public Law 86-90 was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 1, pages 1032-1037. The story goes back to August 1958, and relates how we first failed with it under the sponsorship of Congressman Cretella of Connecticut.

But then, as now, I was convinced that the captive nations—and I mean all 22 and more—are Khrushchev's permanent nightmare and, at the same time, our 1,000-megaton political weapon. Then, as now, I felt we were allowing this weapon to rust and corrode under a heap of political clichés about simply remembering the captive peoples. We tried again and, as you know, Congress passed the resolution in July 1959. The events that followed furnish incontestable proof of the resolution's multimegaton potency in the cold war.

To appreciate the significance of Public Law 86-90 and to grasp the new dimensions and directions for its full implementation, it is necessary to recall these events briefly. What many of us are perhaps unaware of is the fact that the succession of these events started in July 1959 and has continued into the present. The resolution precipitated a series of explosions in Moscow, then and since.

We all recall how Khrushchev exploded when the resolution became law. Vice President Nixon himself was stunned and baffled by Khrushchev's violent reaction. But how many of us realize that since then—in articles, speeches, over the air, and in the U.N.—Khrushchev and his puppets have repeatedly condemned the resolution?

Only this past summer President Kennedy was severely criticized for proclaiming Captive Nations Week. And our nationwide observances of the week have proven to be anathema to Moscow's propaganda and pretensions.

Now, have you ever asked yourself: "How is it that Moscow, with all its vaunted power,

its missiles and bombs, its historical Messianism and also Hitlerian methods of terrorism, should itself be terrified by a simple resolution of our Congress?" In thinking about this you will doubtless wonder about the fact that this wasn't the first time our leaders and Congress spoke in behalf of the captive nations. Perplexing, isn't it? And yet, not mystifying at all.

In the cold war Khrushchev perceives the full import of this resolution, if many of our leaders still don't. He is sensitively aware of the decisive damage that a full, imaginative and skillful implementation of the resolution would wreak upon his colonial empire. He knows that in the eyes of the world it would destroy the projected image of the Soviet Union as a powerful, confident, monolithic state, capable of even competing with the United States.

Khrushchev also knows the tremendous leverage such implementation would provide the 115 million people of the captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union to assert their rights to national freedom, independence, and direct concourse with free world nations and peoples.

Khrushchev knows, too, that the resolution is aimed at all freedom-loving Russians who understand that their nation of 100 million can never be free so long as 22 and more non-Russian nations are held captive under the foreign yoke of Moscow. In short, Khrushchev fears it because it spells trouble, pressure, resistance, insecurity, and ultimate rebellion and disaster within the Soviet Union itself.

CAPTIVE NATIONS: MECHANISM FOR COLD WAR BY WESTERN POWERS

The determining fact here is this: By this resolution our Government recognized for the first time the existence of over a dozen captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. itself. There is no question but that these nations—white Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan, and others—are strategically more important than those we are familiar with in central Europe.

Make no mistake about it, many cold war channels are open to tap the boundless reservoir of patriotic nationalism and historical drives for independence in these occupied nations. All that Khrushchev fears in this respect can in time come to pass without inciting any hot war. In fact, his mounting insecurities within this subempire would definitely work against it.

DEAN MANION. Doctor, this captive nations resolution passed Congress without a dissenting vote. Why has so little been done about it by the executive branch of our Government?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. The reason for this anomalous and self-defeating situation rests on a combination of circumstances. These are: faulty knowledge and basic misconceptions, outright policy contradictions and, consequently, a heavy dose of specious reasoning. In combination they add up to our grave losses in initiative, in launching an offensive, and in developing opportunities for the expansion of freedom.

Let me cite a few concrete examples. This past summer the Secretary of State wrote a letter to Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH, of the House Rules Committee, opposing the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations "at this time." In it he expresses concern that Moscow would not like it, particularly in the Berlin crisis. He also says that governmental and private sources have long been studying this subject anyway. On this I publicly challenge Secretary Rusk to produce any comprehensive study dealing, for example, with Soviet Russian economic colonialism within the Soviet Union. But with contextual propriety, let me quote this from his letter. He says:

"The U.S. Government position is weakened by any action which confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations

with the status of areas, such as the Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia, which are traditional parts of the Soviet Union. Reference to these latter areas places the U.S. Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of a historical state."

Ponder this statement carefully. It will be a classic on how to lose the cold war. The poor state of knowledge, interpretation, and vision reflected by it is well nigh appalling at this perilous juncture of our history. Each of the countries mentioned was independent in the post-World War I period, was recognized by Soviet Russia and numerous other countries, and has fought valiantly to this day to regain its independence, but the Secretary says, in effect, so what, they are "traditional parts of the Soviet Union."

The Soviet Union has scarcely been in existence for 40 years, but Mr. Rusk deems this traditional enough to seal the fate of the first victims of Soviet Russian imperialism. If he tries to wiggle out of this by interpreting the Soviet Union as a successor to the historical state of the czarist Russian Empire, he is even worse off. Armenia was not a traditional part of this historical state and since when has our State Department become the sanctifier of the Russian Empire, whether white or red?

The President has declared that we support "the just aspirations of all people for national independence and freedom." The Congress did the same in the captive nations resolution, which lists, among others, Armenia, Georgia, and Ukraine. Khrushchev, deeply stung by these declarations, grows hoarse telling these captives that they are independent. But some in the State Department obtusely brush all this aside and, in effect say—don't bother about them, don't even study their plight, for they are traditional parts of the Russian Empire.

One may ask: "What has happened to the heirs of the American Revolution about whom President Kennedy spoke in his inaugural address?" Can you imagine what would have been the course of our history if the revolutionaries of 1776 had swallowed similar talk about traditional parts of the British Empire—not for 40 years, not for a century, but almost for two centuries?

FULL-SCALE CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRY INTO STATE DEPARTMENT BADLY NEEDED

We antagonize our ally Portugal by joining Moscow in a U.N. inquiry into Angola, a traditional part of the Portuguese Empire for 300 years, but we spare the enemy the embarrassment and even defeat in the cold war by suppressing official inquiries into his closest colonies. In my judgment, these and other contradictions warrant a full-scale congressional inquiry into State Department policy regarding the Soviet Union.

To appreciate why we're plagued by such contradictions, let me cite another example, one among many. The State Department has a research medium titled "Soviet Affairs Notes." In the issue numbered 158, on the very first page, the reader is told the following:

"The term 'Ukraine' is itself a modern political rather than a historical term. It was invented in the 19th century by nationalists seeking to detach the southwestern borderlands of Russia from the tsarist empire."

Tomes have been written by French, German, English, and other writers of the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, using the term "Ukraine." In previous centuries, and as far back as the 12th century, this so-called borderland of Russia was widely referred to as Ukraine. But, for our State Department experts, it is only a 19th century invention. You can draw your own conclusions from this.

DEAN MANION. Doctor, tell us about Congressman Flood's resolution, House Resolu-

tion 211. What would it accomplish and what can our listeners do to get it passed?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, is the original sponsor of the resolution to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I have been informed that there are about 39 similar resolutions. The Republican congressional policy committee is on record favoring such a committee.

Because of the mentioned State Department letter, action on the measure was postponed to the next session. Congressman MADDEN, of Indiana, insisted that a State Department representative appear before the Rules Committee in person, thereby giving all interested Members an opportunity for questioning, but a letter was sent instead.

It should be obvious that methodic and continuous studies by such a committee would be of great service to the State Department and other executive agencies. They would continually inform the public of developments in all the captive nations. The committee would steadily focus the spotlight of free world attention on Moscow's colonial empire and, I can assure you, given the chance, it would produce recommendations of the greatest value to our national interest.

Write to the members of the House Rules Committee and also to your own Congressman, urging them to pass this measure. Copies to Congressman FLOOD will be put to good use.

Dean MANION. Dr. Dobriansky, in your opinion, would it be helpful to the resurrection of freedom and national independence in the captive nations if we would break off diplomatic relations with these puppet Communist governments that the Kremlin has put in charge of the captive peoples?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. As one who strongly opposes the recognition of Peking and also Outer Mongolia, I say yes, but at the right time. Diplomatic recognition is a powerful weapon if used prudently. At the time of the Hungarian revolution the breaking off of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. and its puppets, in coordination with other moves, could have liberated Hungary.

Pursuing then as now a costly policy of patched-up containment whereby we only react, are continually on the defensive, anticipate little, plan haphazardly, we ourselves reduce the power of such action.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

My friends, the place to begin the use of our best weapon against the Communists and the Kremlin is with the passage of Congressman Flood's House Resolution 211 (see Manion Forum broadcast No. 355). Your Congressman is at home now. See him about the Flood resolution.

THE SECOND RUSK LETTER

Mr. Speaker, as though to make matters worse, a second letter from the Department of State was sent on December 27, 1961, to the House Rules Committee. The irrelevancy of this letter to the criticisms made of the first letter is almost patently clear from further reading of this material. A rejoinder to the second Rusk letter by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University shows also the rather poor state of thought and fact revealed by the State Department.

Because of the crucial importance of this whole issue on a special committee I wish to insert the December 27 letter

and the rejoinder to it at this point in the RECORD:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., December 27, 1961.
Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has come to my attention that certain passages in my letter to you of August 22, 1961, concerning the proposed establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations have been cited as evidence that this Government is reducing its support for the national aspirations of the minority peoples of the U.S.S.R.

There is no change in the U.S. Government's long-established policy toward the peoples of the U.S.S.R. As in the past, the U.S. Government continues to support the just aspirations of all the peoples of the U.S.S.R., without attempting to prejudge the political arrangements which might be preferred by those peoples if they were free to choose them.

My letter of August 22, 1961, did not signify any change in this policy, and the present letter is designed to reaffirm our continuing policy as set forth above. The Department plans to respond to any further inquiries about the matter by stating that the committee has been informed to this effect.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

FEBRUARY 14, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Upon my return a few days ago from an extensive tour of Taiwan and its offshore islands I was apprised of the letter sent to you last December 27 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. The Secretary's letter is supposed to pertain to House Resolution 211 and the 39 other resolutions proposing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

It may seem presumptuous of me to offer this rejoinder to the Secretary's attempt at covering up the basic factual mistakes committed in his earlier letter of August 22, 1961. But inasmuch as I am unaware of any other public disclosure of these fundamental mistakes, I presume the Secretary's letter refers to my radio broadcast of November 12 over the Manion Forum network. For your committee's further consideration of House Resolution 211, I wish to submit a copy of that broadcast and respectfully request that you carefully compare the substantive material shown on pages 2-3 with the contents of the Secretary's December 27 communication.

I don't know who prepares the Secretary's letters, but it is evident that each communication on the subject of captive nations furnishes us additional evidence for the necessity of a special committee. In this last letter the Secretary evinces a conception of the U.S.S.R. which is at total variance with known facts and, incidentally, also with the well-founded conception described by our U.N. Ambassador in an official letter-memo to U.N. delegations, dated November 25, 1961. The Secretary's false notion that the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. are merely "minority peoples of the U.S.S.R." is objectionable on both scholarly and pragmatic political grounds. By his logic, if Poland were to be forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R.—as had been Lithuania, Ukraine, Georgia and others—the Polish nation would be transformed simply into a "minority people."

Again, it amazes one to find our Secretary of State denying the nationhood, not to mention the nominal statehood, of Lithuania, Latvia, Ukraine, and others, while

Moscow, forced by multinationalist pressures within the U.S.S.R. fully recognizes both their nationhood and statehood, and even propagandizes the independence of the latter. Rarely, if at all, does Moscow refer to these nations as "minority peoples." It knows history, it knows the forces at work within its basic empire. The January 1962 issue of U.S.S.R., in which the non-Russian republics are enumerated and described, is a good handy example of my point.

Moreover, it is mystifying to me, as I am sure it is to you, that the Secretary should have addressed himself to the Rules Committee on the subject of "the U.S. Government's long-established policy toward the peoples of the U.S.S.R." What this has to do with the factfinding aims and objectives of the proposed special committee is beyond me. From a reading of the enclosed broadcast text it will be quite obvious to you that in his letter the Secretary sidesteps completely my substantive factual strictures and, instead, confuses the issue of a proposed special committee by concentrating on a policy issue which properly belongs to the Foreign Affairs Committee. It would appear from all this that perhaps the Secretary fears the prospect of a special committee's factual investigations which would cast a public light on the possible limitations of this "long-established policy." His own conceptions and the vague statement of this policy in his letter of the 27th would support this inference.

As you know, there have been many maneuvers to sidetrack the proposal for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The current one of suddenly holding hearings on some of the captive nations before a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee in no way can match the aims, objectives and envisioned work of a special committee. Popular support for such a committee continues strong, and I feel sure that in response to this support, as well as by desire to see a serious job done in behalf of our national interest, you will soon bring the proposal to a favorable consideration by the committee.

With kindest regards and best wishes from one Virginian to another, I am,
Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

Mr. Speaker, with this detailed information now available, I feel that additional remarks on my part would be superfluous. I reiterate my plea that the House move to create this Special Committee on Captive Nations despite the State Department's unwillingness to develop an effective position on the subject or the State Department's present-day ignorance of conditions in Eastern Europe.

THE DUTIES OF THE SPEAKER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Members receive inquiries about the duties of the Speaker. In a representative democracy, where the top leadership posts in the National Legislature are among the most powerful in the land, citizens have a legitimate interest in the functions and duties of these positions. Let me take this means, therefore, of describing in some detail

the duties of the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives as they have developed in our parliamentary practice.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

Under the Constitution, the Members of Congress and of the State legislatures, as well as all executive and judicial officers, must take an oath or make an affirmation to support the Constitution. Customarily, this oath is first administered to the Speaker at the opening of a new Congress by the oldest Member of the House in point of continuous service, and then by the Speaker to the other Members and to the Clerk of the House. That practice is not always followed, however. Thus, on May 19, 1919, the oath of office was administered to Speaker Frederick H. Gillett, himself the "Father of the House," by Representative Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, who, though the Member of longest service, was one of the younger Members of the House in consecutive service.

Formerly it was the custom to administer the oath by State delegations, but beginning with the 71st Congress Members-elect have been sworn in en masse. The Speaker has frequently declined to administer the oath in cases where the House has, by its action, indicated that he should not do so; and in case of doubt he has waited the instruction of the House. The right of a Member-elect to take the oath is sometimes challenged, and in such cases the Speaker may direct the Member to stand aside temporarily. For example, on December 5, 1927, Speaker Longworth directed Mr. James M. Beck to stand aside temporarily because his right to take the oath had been challenged on the ground that he was not an inhabitant of Pennsylvania.

CALLING THE HOUSE TO ORDER

From the beginning of the First Congress the House has formulated rules to govern its procedure. At the present time the House rulebook contains some 42 rules. The first of these rules sets forth the duties of the Speaker in seven sections. Section 1 states:

The Speaker shall take the chair on every legislative day precisely at the hour to which the House shall have adjourned at the last sitting, immediately call the Members to order, and on the appearance of a quorum, cause the Journal of the proceedings of the last day's sitting to be read, having previously examined and approved the same.

This rule dates from 1789 and the House usually meets at 12 o'clock noon. In practice, immediately after the Members are called to order, prayer is offered by the House Chaplain.

PRESERVES ORDER AND DECORUM

Section 2 of rule I states that the Speaker "shall preserve order and decorum, and, in case of disturbance or disorderly conduct in the galleries, or in the lobby, may cause the same to be cleared." This rule also dates from 1789. The Speaker may name a Member who is disorderly, but may not, of his own authority, censure or punish him. In an early instance the Speaker ordered the arrest of a person in the gallery; but this exercise of power was questioned.

CONTROLS HALL OF THE HOUSE

Section 3, which was adopted in 1811, provides that the Speaker "shall have general control of the Hall of the House, and of the corridors and passages and the disposal of the unappropriated rooms in that part of the Capitol assigned to the use of the House."

The Hall of the House, a large chamber on the second floor of the House wing of the Capitol, is the place where the House has met since 1857.

SIGNS ACTS AND DECIDES QUESTIONS OF ORDER

Section 4, which was adopted in 1789 and 1794, states that the Speaker "shall sign all acts, addresses, joint resolutions, writs, warrants, and subpoenas of, or issued by order of, the House, and decide all questions of order, subject to an appeal by any Member, on which appeal no Member shall speak more than once, unless by permission of the House."

In accordance with this rule, the Speaker signs enrolled bills, articles of impeachment, warrants, and subpoenas, and certifies cases of contumacious witnesses for action by the courts. As regard points of order, the Speaker may require them to be presented in writing; but he is not required to decide a question not directly presented by the proceedings or hypothetical questions. In rare instances the Speaker has declined to rule on a question of order until he has had time to study it; and on occasion the Chair has reversed as erroneous decisions previously made. The right of appeal protects the House against the arbitrary control of the Speaker and the House cannot be deprived of it.

PUTS THE QUESTION

The Speaker's fifth duty under rule I is to put questions under the proper form by saying:

"As many as are in favor, say 'aye'; and then 'as many as are opposed, say 'no'." If he doubts, or a division is called for, the House shall divide; those in the affirmative of the question shall first rise from their seats, and then those in the negative; if he still doubts, or a count is required by at least one-fifth of a quorum, he shall name one from each side of the question to tell the Members in the affirmative and negative; which being reported, he shall rise and state the decision.

This rule was adopted in 1789 and amended in 1860 and 1880. Parliamentary law is based upon the assumption that the Speaker will not betray his duty to make an honest count on a division; and the integrity of the Chair in counting a vote has never been questioned in the House. When the House votes by tellers, the Members pass between them to vote, the tellers standing on either side of the center aisle to count the Representatives as they file by, the ayes passing through first and then the nays.

THE SPEAKER'S VOTE

Section 6 states that the Speaker "shall not be required to vote in ordinary legislative proceedings, except where his vote would be decisive, or where the House is engaged in voting by ballot; and in cases of a tie vote the question shall be lost." This rule was adopted in 1789 and amended in 1850. The Speaker's

name is not on the roll from which the yeas and nays are called unless at his request, in which case the Clerk calls him by name at the end of the roll. The Chair may vote to make a tie and so decide a question in the negative, as he may vote to break a tie and decide a question in the affirmative. The Speaker has the same right as other Members to vote, but rarely exercises it. A recent example of such an exercise occurred on August 14, 1957, when Speaker Rayburn broke a tie by voting for the passage of a bill amending the Interstate Commerce Act.

APPOINTS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Finally, section 7 of rule I provides that the Speaker—"shall have the right to name any Member to perform the duties of the Chair, but such substitution shall not extend beyond 3 legislative days: *Provided, however,* That in case of his illness, he may make such appointment for a period not exceeding 10 days, with the approval of the House at the time the same is made; and in his absence and omission to make such appointment, the House shall proceed to elect a Speaker pro tempore to act during his absence."

You will recall that it was in accordance with this rule that I was appointed and elected Speaker pro tempore last September when Mr. Rayburn was forced by illness to lay down his gavel.

COUNTING A QUORUM

Another important duty of the Speaker is to determine the presence of a quorum which the Constitution requires for the conduct of business by the House. The quorum consists of a majority of those Members chosen, sworn, and living whose membership has not been terminated by resignation or by the action of the House. The Chair counts all Members in sight, whether they are in the cloakrooms or on the floor of the House. When a quorum fails on a yeas-and-nays vote, it is the duty of the Speaker to take note of that fact and to direct the roll to be called. Prior to 1890 the business of the House was often obstructed by the failure of present Members to respond to a rollcall to make a quorum. But in 1890, after a sensational fight, Speaker Reed decided to count both those voting and those present but not voting to make a quorum of record on a rollcall. His decision was adopted as a rule of the House at that time, and continues in effect.

ADMISSION TO THE GALLERIES

Various galleries in the Hall of the House are reserved for the use of the families of Members, the President of the United States, the members of his Cabinet, Justices of the Supreme Court, foreign ministers and their families, and for representatives of the press. Admission to these galleries is subject to the direction and control of the Speaker, who is assisted in the case of the press galleries by a standing committee of correspondents. Representatives of the press associations may also be admitted to the House floor under conditions prescribed by the Speaker.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

Under rule X the Speaker appoints all select and conference committees which shall be ordered by the House from time to time. A select committee is a temporary committee, composed of Members of the House, established for a particular purpose; for example, to investigate campaign expenditures. A conference committee is a joint committee, composed of Members of both the House and the Senate, established to reconcile the differences between bills on the same subjects that have passed the two Houses. Prior to 1880 the Member moving a select committee was appointed its chairman, and prior to 1910 the chairmen of the standing committees of the House were appointed by the Speaker. It is within the discretion of the Chair as to whom he appoints as conferees. Conference committees are set up in every session of Congress on many legislative proposals.

APPOINTMENT OF HOUSE OFFICERS

Another function of the Speaker is to make temporary appointments, in case of vacancies in House offices, of persons to perform their duties, until the House chooses their successors or until the incapacity or inability of the incumbent is terminated. The elective officers of the House include a Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Postmaster, and Chaplain who are elected by the House at the beginning of each new Congress. Under this authority the Speaker, in the 83d Congress, appointed a temporary Sergeant at Arms.

DUTIES AS TO REFERENCE OF BILLS, PETITIONS, MEMORIALS

Another group of the Speaker's duties relates to the reference of bills, petitions, and memorials. Under rule XXII he refers all bills, memorials, and resolutions that have been introduced by Members to the appropriate committee of the House; and under rule XXIV messages from the President, reports and communications from department heads, and bills, resolutions, and messages from the Senate are referred by the Speaker to the appropriate committees. From the earliest days the rules of the House have given its standing committees jurisdiction over the various subjects of legislation. The entire legislative domain has been divided into distinct categories defined by the rules, and jurisdiction over each category has been allocated to a particular standing committee. In making these referrals the Speaker is assisted by the Parliamentarian of the House. Under rule XIII the Speaker directs the Clerk to call bills on the Consent Calendar on the first and third Mondays of each month; and under rule XXII the Speaker may bar the reference of petitions, memorials, and private bills which, in his judgment, are of an obscene or insulting character.

POWER AND DUTIES AS TO RECOGNITION

In the House of Representatives recognition by the Chair is governed by rule XIV, clause 2, and the practice thereunder. There has been no appeal from a decision by the Speaker on a question of recognition since 1881 and in the later practice no appeal is permitted.

Clause 2 of rule XIV, as adopted in 1789, states that—

When two or more Members rise at once, the Speaker shall name the Member who is first to speak.

In the early history of the House, when business proceeded on presentation by individual Members, the Speaker recognized the Member who arose first; and in case of doubt there was an appeal from his recognition. But as the membership and business of the House increased, it became necessary to establish and adhere to a fixed order of business, and recognitions, instead of pertaining to the individual Member, necessarily came to pertain to the bill or other business which would be before the House under the rule regulating the order of business. Hence the necessity that the Speaker should not be compelled to heed the claims of Members as individuals was expressed in 1879 in a report from the Committee on Rules, which declared that "in the nature of the case discretion must be lodged with the presiding officer." And in 1881 the Speaker declined to entertain an appeal from his decision on a question of recognition, establishing thereby a practice which has continued down to date.

Although there is no appeal from the Speaker's recognition, he is not a free agent in determining who is to have the floor. The practice of the House establishes rules from which he may not depart. It is because the Speaker is governed by usages that he often asks, when a Member seeks recognition, "For what purpose does the gentleman rise?" By this question he determines whether the Member proposes business or a motion which is entitled to precedence; he may deny recognition and from such denial there is no appeal.

In debate the members of the committee in charge of the bill—except the Committee of the Whole—are entitled to priority of recognition for debate. In recognizing for general debate the Chair alternates between those favoring and those opposing the pending matter, preferring members of the committee reporting the bill. When a member of the committee has occupied the floor in favor of a measure, a Member opposing should be recognized next even though he be not a member of the committee. The principle of alternation is not insisted on rigidly where a limited time is controlled by Members, as in the "40 minutes" of debate on motions for suspension of the rules and the previous question.

As to motions to suspend the rules, which are in order on 2 days each month, the Speaker exercises a discretion to decline to recognize. He also may decline to recognize a Member who desires to ask unanimous consent to set aside the rules in order to consider a bill not otherwise in order, this being the way of signifying his objection to the request.

DUTIES IN RELATION TO DEBATE

The Speaker also has three duties in relation to debate on the House floor: First, to suppress the arraignment of the motives of Members; second, not to permit expressions offensive to the Sen-

ate; and, third, to call to order Members who transgress the rules of the House. When a Member is called to order under this rule—rule XIV, clause 4—it is the practice to test the opinion of the House by a motion "that the gentleman be allowed to proceed in order." A Member called to order and held to be out of order loses the floor and may not proceed.

If a point of order is made against words spoken in debate without a demand that they be taken down, the Chair ordinarily admonishes the offender and, if he continues to transgress the rules, stops him.

An interesting instance in which the House censured a Member for disorderly words occurred 40 years ago. On October 27, 1921, the House by a unanimous vote censured Representative Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas, for inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech containing foul and obscene matter. The censure was administered by Speaker Gillett to Mr. Blanton at the bar of the House.

AS TO VOTING

Under the Constitution, the yeas and nays of the Members of the House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal. In passing on a demand for the yeas and nays the Speaker need determine only whether one-fifth of those present sustain the demand; in making this determination he counts the entire number present, including those in the lobbies and cloakrooms, and not merely those who rise to be counted.

An interesting example of this procedure occurred on June 10, 1921, when Mr. Oscar E. Bland, of Indiana, moved to recommit a bill to establish a Veterans' Bureau in the Treasury Department to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with instructions. The question being taken, Mr. Bland demanded the yeas and nays. The demand being put, the Speaker pro tempore announced that 44 Members had arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays were refused. Mr. Bland submitted that 44 constituted one-fifth of the Members present, and asked that those present be counted. The Speaker pro tempore proceeded to count when Mr. Sam Rayburn, of Texas, asked that Members retiring from the Hall be counted. The Speaker pro tempore then said:

Under the precedents the House is not considered as limited merely to the Hall of the House, but also includes the cloakrooms and the lobby adjacent to the Chamber. The Chair included in his count 193 Members on the floor of the Chamber, 11 who had left the Chamber after the demand for the other side had been made—a sufficient number, and the Clerk will call the roll.

RELATIONS TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

From earliest days the House has had a procedure called going into Committee of the Whole. This is a procedure for expediting business in which a quorum is 100 Members and bills are debated under a 5-minute rule. When the House goes into Committee of the Whole, the Speaker leaves the chair after appointing a Chairman to preside and takes a seat elsewhere, as any other Member.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole seats himself in the Speaker's chair and the mace is placed beneath the table. When the Committee of the Whole rises, the Speaker resumes the Chair and recognizes only reports from the Committee of the Whole made by the Chairman thereof. On several occasions when quarrels have taken place in Committee of the Whole, the Speaker has taken the chair in order to suppress the disorder and the mace, as the symbol of authority, has been laid on the table.

For example, on September 9, 1841, while the House was in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, an encounter took place between two Members, Henry A. Wise, of Virginia, and Edward Stanly, of North Carolina. Great heat and confusion arising and the Committee being in disorder, the Speaker took the chair and brought the House to order. Both Members made explanations and Mr. Wise apologized to the House.

DUTIES AS TO CONFERENCES

From the earliest years the Speaker has appointed the House managers of conference committees. He selects them within his discretion so as to represent the attitude of the majority and the minority of the House on the disagreements in issue with the Senate. While it is usual to represent the party divisions of the House, the representation of opinions as to the pending differences is rather the more important consideration. In appointing managers the Speaker usually consults the Member in charge of the bill, and selects the managers from the committee which reported the bill; but where the committee which has charge holds to an attitude to which the House disagrees, the managers have been appointed to reflect the views of the House.

When the House managers report to the House after a conference, the Speaker may rule out their report if it be shown that the managers have exceeded their authority. This happened, for example, on June 22, 1926, when Speaker Longworth held that the conferees on a bill to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations had gone beyond the differences committed to them.

DUTIES AS TO JOURNAL AND RECORD

As I pointed out at the beginning of these remarks, the Speaker takes the chair at the opening of each daily sitting and causes the Journal of the proceedings of the last day's sitting to be read, having previously examined and approved the same. Under rule 34, the appointment and removal, for cause, of the official reporters of the House, including committee stenographers, and the manner of the execution of their duties, are vested in the Speaker. The reporters of debates have borne an important part in the evolution by which the House has built up the system of a daily verbatim report of its proceedings, made by its own corps of reporters. In general, the Speaker has no control over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but words spoken by a Member after he has been called to order may be excluded by direction of the Speaker. House precedents reveal instances in which the Speaker

has ordered remarks made by Members who have not been recognized, as well as flagrantly disorderly words, to be stricken from the RECORD.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that President Kennedy has issued Executive Order No. 11007 prescribing regulations for the formation and use of advisory committees in the Federal Government. The order carries out to a considerable degree the recommendations made by the Committee on Government Operations to the President last spring, and substantially adopts the standards set forth in H.R. 7390, which I introduced, that was passed by the House in 1957 but which failed of enactment by the Senate. Our understanding then was that the Senate failed to act on the bill in a belief that administrative action was possible and that legislation could be avoided.

Prior to that, as some will recall, an extended study had been made by our committee into the utilization of advisory committees by the Government as a whole. We found, among other things, that there was a great number of these committees in use involving thousands of individuals and that there were no uniform standards which were being followed in the organization and functioning of these committees. Some of them were not always under the direct control of the agency to which they were giving advice and many meetings were held in secrecy with no record kept of their proceedings. There was obvious danger to the Government in this type of operation and we called this to the attention of the Congress.

In my bill, we required the advance reporting to the Congress of the formation and membership of advisory committees and an annual report by the President on the use of advisory committees Government-wide. We set up certain minimum standards such as that meetings shall be at the call of and under the chairmanship of a full-time salaried officer of the Government and the agenda for the meeting should be formulated or approved by such an officer; that full and complete minutes of each meeting should be kept and that the functions of the committee should be purely advisory.

Now, 4½ years later, I am happy to say, President Kennedy has seen the wisdom of adopting definite standards and controls along these lines and has issued this order. The Executive order decrees that no advisory committee shall be formed or utilized unless specifically authorized by law or specifically found as a matter of formal record by the head of the department or agency concerned

to be in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on that department or agency by law. In other words, no advisory committees will be formed unless the Congress has enacted a statute specifically authorizing such committee or the Secretary or Administrator determines in a formal recorded manner that such committee is in the public interest under duties imposed on his department or agency by law. The order states that unless specifically authorized by law, no committee shall be utilized for functions not solely advisory and further that determinations of action to be taken on advice will in all cases be made solely by officers or employees of the Government. In my judgment this puts the responsibility for decision and action where it belongs.

Industry committees will henceforth be reasonably representative and an effort will be made to achieve a cross section of interests and viewpoints, rather than be weighted toward any segment in a given industry.

Meetings of the advisory committees shall be held only at the call of, or with the advance approval of, a full-time salaried officer of the Government with an agenda formulated or approved by such officer. The meetings shall be under the chairmanship or conducted in the presence of a full-time salaried officer or employee of the Government who shall have the authority and be required to adjourn any meeting whenever he considers it to be in the public interest.

Minutes will be kept of each meeting which shall contain as a minimum the names of those present, a description of matters discussed and conclusions reached, and copies of all reports received, issued or approved by the committee. The accuracy of such minutes will be certified by a Government officer actually present during the meeting. For industry advisory committees, a verbatim transcript will be kept of all proceedings at each meeting, including the names of all persons present, their affiliation and the capacity in which they attend. There is a proviso here, however, that where the head of the department or agency concerned determines that a verbatim transcript would interfere with the proper functioning of the committee or would be impracticable, he may authorize the keeping of minutes such as for all other types of committees.

The President's order will not permit industry advisory committees to receive, compile or discuss data or reports showing the current or projected commercial operations of identified business enterprises. This, of course, is to prevent one industry from having an advantage over another because of its representation on a committee.

The department or agency head is given discretion and may waive compliance with these standards if he deems it to be in the public interest and they may interfere with the proper functioning of such committee. But in all cases a formal determination by the department or agency head must be made.

The order terminates all advisory committees, unless their terminal date is fixed by law, in 2 years from the date

of their formalization, unless the department or agency head determines in writing that they should be extended.

All of these standards and controls are reasonable and, I believe, necessary. Certainly no one can contend that major governmental decisions should be made by private citizens, nor that important advice must necessarily be given to the Government in secrecy unless there is some overriding necessity for such secrecy. Furthermore, these committees should not be laws unto themselves but under the direct control of the department or agency to which they are giving advice.

There is no antibusiness flavor nor any effort that I see to impugn the motives of any business, professional or scientific adviser. The purpose of these standards is to avoid even the appearance of conflict of interest. Government is, and properly should be, a goldfish bowl unless questions of national security are involved.

President Kennedy's action in resolving this long-lasting and highly troublesome problem is indicative of his personal attention and desire to improve administration and is a significant step forward in freedom of information necessary to the public and other Government agencies in eliminating and reducing possible conflicts of interest inimical to the public.

"OUR HERO"

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., received formal tribute not only by our great Nation but from nations throughout the world.

An excellent poem by Mrs. Jessie M. Williams, of Chicago, Ill., entitled "Our Hero" is very deserving and appropriate in recognition of this momentous event.

Under unanimous consent, I include this poem in the RECORD so America can read it:

OUR HERO

It was done again
Success to hear and see
Where else, but in America
Could you watch it on TV
A space man into orbit
Three times he traveled round
A speed that seems impossible
He's still with us, well and sound
Where else but in our country
Can they boast of such as this
America the beautiful
A Hero in our midst
As we watched the count down
The lift off from the pad
A silent prayer was said by all
For this Heroic lad
His mission was accomplished
A smile upon his face
He makes Americans very proud
"Our Hero" man in space.

EUROPEAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, A new terror stalks Europe.

For a segment of the remains of the European Jewish Community which survived the Hitlerian holocaust, the almost 17 years since the smashing of the Nazi war machine means little more today than it is the victim of a new oppressor. That all is not well with Soviet citizens of Jewish faith has now become alarmingly clear.

This is not to suggest that Soviet Jewry is the target of government-sanctioned programs, organized mass murder or wholesale deportation. The persecution is far more subtle. It aims at a "deculturization" of Russia's Jews—the destruction of all things Jewish. Thus, although Soviet Jews do not perish in gas chambers and concentration camps, Kremlin authorities have given evidence, by word and by deed, that the objective of its anti-Jewish campaign is the same as that of Nazi Germany more than two decades ago—the extinction of Jewish life.

It is no exaggeration to say that whatever limitations the Soviet Government may have placed upon itself in its current anti-Jewish programs stem directly from fear of adverse world opinion. Indeed, one shudders to think what fate might lie in store for Russian Jewry if the leaders of the Government of the Soviet Union believed that the world were to "little remember, nor long note" its actions.

And it is for this reason—to remind again the Soviet leaders that the world is aware of its mistreatment of its Jewish population—that I introduced on February 28 two resolutions; first, House Concurrent Resolution 440 expressing the sense of the Congress that the U.S. Mission to the U.N. should seek the adoption by the U.N. of a resolution condemning the recent manifestation of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; and second, House Concurrent Resolution 441, expressing the sense of the Congress that the U.N. Human Rights Commission should increase its activities and give greater publicity to instances of discrimination and persecution in order to focus world opinion upon these practices and nations engaged therein.

This great Nation, which serves not only as a symbol of religious freedom, but as the leader of the entire free world, has an abiding obligation to speak out on behalf of oppressed peoples everywhere in the world.

It has been argued that Russian mistreatment of its Jewish population is purely an internal matter. With this, I take vigorous exception. In my view, the practiced persecution of religious minority anywhere in the world is a blow to freedom for all people. Indeed, this is the very essence of the existence of the United Nations.

The preamble to the Charter of the United Nations—of which the United States is one of the most important signatories—provides that:

We the people of the United Nations determined . . . to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person . . . to prac-

tice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors . . . have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

The charter states further that it shall be the purpose of the United Nations—to achieve international cooperation . . . in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction to race, sex, language, or religion.

I submit that Soviet actions against its Jewish population are violations of these principles. I cite such actions as the arrest of numerous Jewish religious leaders on patently trumped-up charges, the closing of many synagogues, and the continued travel restrictions being placed upon persons entering or leaving the Soviet Union, a situation which prevents separated Jewish families from being reunited.

As responsible members of the United Nations, as recognized leaders of the free world, as a nation whose proudest achievement is a concern for the liberty and freedom of all people, I propose that this Government take the leadership in bringing to the world attention the matter of Soviet mistreatment of its Jewish population.

Because the Soviet Union's actions are contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter, the United Nations has a direct and legitimate interest in the welfare and safety of the Jewish community of Russia.

To help bring these facts to world attention, to the end that the world organization can bring pressure to bear upon Soviet authorities for a cessation of its anti-Jewish program, I now, therefore, call upon the House of Representatives to express the sense of the Congress that the U.S. mission to the United Nations should seek the early adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of a resolution condemning these recent manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and calling upon the Soviet Union to adopt such measures as may be necessary to guarantee human rights, including the right of persons separated from their families to be reunited with them.

I further propose that the House of Representatives express the sense of Congress that the U.S. mission to the United Nations should seek to obtain by appropriate means an increase in the activities of the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations, in such fashion as to provide greater publicity to instances where nations practice discrimination against minorities, or persecution of minorities, and to provide for direct representation to be made by the Commission to such nations in instances where such persecutions exist, to the end that such activities shall cease.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. DANIELS), for today, March 7, on account of official business.

Mr. INOUE, for the period beginning March 22, 1962, to and including March 29, 1962, on account of official business.

in the State of Hawaii at the invitation of the Senate Committee on Public Works.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Bow, for 30 minutes, on Monday next, vacating his special order for today.

Mr. HARDING, for 20 minutes, today.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois), for 10 minutes on Thursday, March 8, 1962.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STRATTON.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. MONTROYA in two instances.

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. McDOWELL to include extraneous matter in his remarks made during the Committee on the Whole on H.R. 132.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 8, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1781. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), relative to a proposal by the Department of the Navy to transfer two surplus boats to the city of San Leandro, Calif., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1782. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, relative to a proposed disposition of approximately 10 million pounds of contained nickel plus cobalt in nickel oxide powder now held

in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C., 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1783. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting regulations specifying standards for approval by the Secretary of the Interior of zoning bylaws, pursuant to section 5 of the act of August 7, 1961 (75 Stat. 284); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1784. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the assignment of national service life insurance"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1785. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the second report by the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, on property acquisitions for stockpile purposes for the quarter ending December 31, 1961, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and Executive Order 10952, effective August 1, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1786. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 27th Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 23(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, approved June 6, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1787. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting estimates of the costs of the proposal for Federal salary reform transmitted with the President's special message on Federal pay reform of February 20, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 801, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9751. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1407. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 9778. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain steel and steel products donated for an addition to the Chippewa County War Memorial Hospital, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 557. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10264, a bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 438 Members beginning with the 88th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1409). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Joint Economic Committee. Annual report on the January 1962 Economic Report of the President (Rept. No. 1410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 10575. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10576. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10577. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 10578. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 200 Members beginning with the 89th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 10579. A bill to amend section 9(b) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit labor organizations representing guards to be admitted to certain affiliations of labor organizations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 10580. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 10581. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small-business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance, repair, or construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 10582. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 10583. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 10584. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H.R. 10585. A bill to amend section 501 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 10586. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, with respect to space communications facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 10587. A bill to amend clause (3) of section 402(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 10588. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the city of Milan, Tenn., of cer-

tain interests reserved by the United States in and to certain property heretofore conveyed to such city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 10589. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 10590. A bill to amend section 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, with respect to coverage of former Members of Congress employed by the Government without compensation or with nominal compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 10591. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to prohibit assistance under that act to the government of any country which has not established equitable procedures for compensating U.S. citizens for loss of property by expropriation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 10592. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 10593. A bill to preserve wheat acreage history; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 10594. A bill to amend section 372 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to privately owned nonprofit agricultural research and experiment stations or foundations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 10595. A bill to facilitate the sale and disposal of Government stocks of extra long staple cotton; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 10596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as retirement annuities or pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.J. Res. 652. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week of July 15 to 21, 1962, as National Drum Corps Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.J. Res. 653. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the U.S. World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, N.Y., from May 11 through May 22, 1962; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H.J. Res. 654. Joint resolution designating the week of July 15 to July 21, 1962, as National Drum Corps Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.J. Res. 655. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Con. Res. 450. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.R. 10597. A bill for the relief of Preston H. Haskell, Jr., and Ellis Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 10598. A bill for the relief of Preston H. Haskell, Jr., and Ellis Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 10599. A bill for the relief of Preston H. Haskell, Jr., and Ellis Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 10600. A bill for the relief of Preston H. Haskell, Jr., and Ellis Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 10601. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katina Nanouri Kokinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 10602. A bill for the relief of Maria DaGloria Mello Pacheco, Fernanda Pacheco Mendonca, Paulo Mendonca, and Maria DaC. Mendonca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 10603. A bill for the relief of Norman McLeod Riach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILCHER:

H.R. 10604. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Gordon C. Bryant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 10605. A bill for the relief of Joan Rosa Orr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Little-People-to-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, there are committees in the House and Senate which have spent many hours, in and out of session, on the subject of juvenile delinquency. Millions of dollars are being spent every year, and will continue to be spent in the future in an attempt to turn the tide against the alarming rate of increase in crime among the members of our younger generation.

How doubly refreshing it is, therefore, to learn of the little-people-to-little-people project of Peter Rodino III, the 10-year-old son of our distinguished colleague from New Jersey.

Young Peter's approach to the problem of securing a peaceful world for himself, his children and the generations to follow will prove to be effective, without doubt. But of primary importance is Peter's awareness that a problem does exist, of his desire to seek a solution, and of his initiative, not only in com-

mencing a most commendable program, but in enlisting the aid and support of his immediate friends until the plan has expanded to national scope.

How proud we must be of such youngsters who are willing—yes, eager—to assume the responsibilities of citizenship at such an early age. We are pleased with the effect the little-people-to-little-people letters will have in the children's crusade for world education. We are proud of our young citizens who are playing an active role in statesmanship and world diplomacy.

And particularly as parents, we must not forget what heartwarming satisfaction young Peter's efforts must give to his father, our colleague, PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

On February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared their independence from the czarist regime in Russia, and for 22 short years were citizens of a free and independent state. During that 22-year period from 1918 to 1940, the people of Lithuania proved themselves to be peace loving, energetic, industrious, and determined in the cause of free government, and the republic, admitted to the League of Nations on September 22, 1921, became a welcome and respected member of the world community.

In 1940 Lithuania was overrun and annexed by the Soviets, and the Iron Curtain was placed between this small Baltic state and the rest of the free world. Since that time the people of Lithuania have been subject to the oppressive rule of the Communist regime.

We all know that the same spirit which inspired independence in 1918, and which made Lithuania a respected member of the world community for 22 years thereafter, is still present among the more than 3 million people of that land.

We are also aware of the substantial contributions made to this country's strength and freedom by Americans of Lithuanian descent who, unlike their relatives and friends behind the Iron Curtain, are free to celebrate this important occasion today.

Our faith in the ultimate victory of freedom and self-determination for all

people is inspired by the spirit of the Lithuanian people, and, as leaders of the free world, we Americans must pledge, on this occasion, all our efforts and energies to this end. And the free world would do well to remember that what has twice happened to Lithuania could happen to any other nation that fails to keep itself strong enough to defend its liberty against aggression.

Statement by the Honorable Joseph M. Montoya, of New Mexico, Praising Air Reservists and Air National Guardsmen Since Recall to Active Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has indeed the right to be proud and happy over our recent accomplishment in achieving orbital flight of an astronaut. And it was with pride that I stood here this past Monday with all Members of the Congress applauding Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., for his magnificent achievement. Yet, this wonderful American refused to accept our good wishes for himself personally, and went out of his way to speak of all others involved in the Mercury program, and to acknowledge their significant accomplishments.

The selflessness of this man, Mr. Speaker, reminded me that we might tend at times to fail to acknowledge adequately the deeds of men behind the news, the men who do so much, but about whom we know and hear so little. At this time, I refer specifically to the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard units who readily answered the Nation's call in time of crises and who today continue their duties and patrols with supreme devotion to duty. They continue to perform their assigned tasks with cheerful determination in spite of personal and family difficulties, inconveniences, and disruptions of civilian pursuits. Secretary of Defense McNamara has written the families of recalled reservists and guardsmen, has appropriately acknowledged the Nation's debt, and has rendered the thanks of a grateful country.

I think we should make it clear in this chamber, Mr. Speaker, that the sacrifices of air reservists and guardsmen and their families have been for a vital purpose and that the Nation does appreciate their continued service. It is not of small significance to note that this is a continued willingness to serve since Air Reserve units are made up entirely of volunteers who have embraced their call to duty in the finest traditions of our Armed Forces and who lost no time in making their presence known.

Air guardsmen flew more than 200 jet fighters over the Atlantic within a month after recall, providing much needed fighter strength for Air Force combat

units in Europe. Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert was most complimentary about these units and their accomplishments and Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, wrote these air guardsmen as follows:

The movement of the newly federalized ANG units to Europe was executed in an orderly, efficient, and professional way. This required the utmost in leadership, planning, and cooperation on the part of all units and personnel involved. All obstacles were overcome by ingenuity and determination in spite of the extremely short preparation time available. The end result of the safe and expeditious arrival of the fighters should be a source of great pride to all who had a part in the operation. I wish to offer my congratulations for the outstanding manner in which this difficult and vitally important task was successfully accomplished.

In addition to the flight of these fighters, Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard squadrons entered on duty with four-engine transport aircraft, the first to be assigned to these components. In 3 months of active duty, the crews of these units flew almost 4 million miles on troop carrier and cargo missions. Also, there are many Air Guard tactical fighter and reconnaissance squadrons which are on combat-ready active duty and poised for deployment wherever national security may require.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the accomplishments of our dedicated Air Reserve and Air National Guard units and I think all of us should be aware of the magnificent job they have done and are doing. In rising to the call in time of crisis, the record shows convincingly that these air reservists and guardsmen are a valuable component of our defense structure and deserving of our high regard and prayerful thanks.

Resolution Calling Upon the President To Issue a Proclamation Declaring the Week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced Concurrent Resolution 450. This resolution calls upon the President to issue a proclamation declaring the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week.

The record of accomplishments of the nonprofit voluntary agencies is a tribute not only to their prudence and ability, to their partnership with our Government, but also to the American people whose generous support of these agencies has made this splendid record possible.

At the present time 58 voluntary agencies are actively engaged in people-to-people programs in some 100 countries and areas. In 1961, these agencies distributed \$12.4 million of self-help, educational, and medical supplies, \$37 mil-

lion in clothing, and \$25.3 million in cash to over 100 million people.

In addition, agricultural commodities, with a Commodity Credit Corporation value of \$147.4 million were made available under Public Law 480 to the agencies.

The Liberal Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the criticisms of some of my colleagues on the publication of a group of essays by admittedly distinguished authors, based upon the fear that an expression of views will corrupt American thought and bring about a new "Munich" is perhaps illustrative of the basic thing that is wrong with the Republican Party. They are afraid to trust their fellow Americans. They believe their fellow Americans must only have available one side of a story, and that the right side from the Republican point of view, or the country will rush toward disaster and a "Munich."

Personally, I have faith in the American people. I believe they are better able to make a judgment when they read all views, from the far right, or Birch Society position, to the far left, as well as those views of the so-called middle.

I doubt whether my Republican friends have read the various articles in "The Liberal Papers." It would make them better Americans to do so, even though such articles might not change their rigid opinions. As an individual, I do not agree with many of the views expressed by the authors of "The Liberal Papers." But I am glad to have read them, as I am glad to have listened and read the speeches of such men as Messrs. Buckley, Schwarz, and the distinguished Member of the other body from Arizona.

America has made progress because we have had a free expression of any and all views. From these have come sound decisions, and I am sorry to see my Republican colleagues try to impugn or be uncomplimentary to those who still believe that this method is the best way to preserve our basic American way of life.

In this spirit, I would like to quote from an American who might not be labeled "liberal," but certainly would be considered a good American. An article by John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, from the American Bar Association Journal of February 1962, entitled "Shall It Be Law or Tyranny?" reads, in part, as follows:

Our fight against communism must be a sane, rational understanding of the facts. Emotional outbursts, extravagant name-calling, gross exaggerations hinder our efforts. We must remember that many non-Communists may legitimately on their own oppose the same laws or take positions on issues of the day which are also held by the

Communists. Their opinions—though temporarily coinciding with the party line—do not make them Communists. Not at all. We must be very careful with our facts and not brand as a Communist any individual whose opinion may be different from our own. Freedom of dissent is a great heritage of America which we must treasure.

With such sentiments perhaps not only the Republican leadership, but most good Americans will agree.

Western Electronics Orders Go National

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this year, the West will account for more than one-fourth of all electronic manufacturing in the United States. In so doing, it will continue to provide the technological leadership that has enabled this Nation to far surpass all others in the development and application of electronic science to modern living.

Many large and significant military contracts are being fulfilled by electronic companies in the Western States. The number of military awards that have been made in this region are evidence of the West's technological capabilities and of the western firms' outstanding performance in quality, price, and delivery dependability.

An estimated 215,000 people were directly employed in electronics in the Western States at the beginning of this year. Many thousands more have jobs in allied industries that are dependent upon electronics.

But the significance of electronic activity in such States as California, Oregon, Washington, and Arizona is felt by factories and business firms clear across the continent. For western companies buy materials, components, and equipment for production of military end-use items in the West from 49 States. Moreover, the buying throughout the United States is done not just by one or a few western companies, but by many.

For example, more than 90 percent of electronic companies in the West buy materials in the State of New York. More than 80 percent do procurement in Illinois, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. Well over half of the western firms buy in such States as Pennsylvania and Michigan, which have widely publicized depressed areas.

Evidence of widespread procurement by western companies was obtained in a special survey conducted in March 1962, by the Western Electronic Manufacturers Association—WEMA. All WEMA member companies, some 325 in number, received questionnaires requesting them to specify the States in which they purchase materials, components, or equipment for the production of military end-use items. A total of 156 companies—mostly in California—responded. The survey participants ranged from very

small companies to the largest electronic complexes in the West.

It is highly significant that 6 out of every 7 participating companies are small business firms—fewer than 500 employees—by Government definition. Thus, the survey results are not distorted by the widespread buying of a few large companies. Rather, the results show that States across the Nation benefit from the procurement practices of many western companies.

Shown below, by State, is the percentage of western electronic companies purchasing materials, supplies, and equipment for military end-use items in each individual State:

Percent of companies purchasing in each State

Rank of State:	
New York	92.31
Illinois	85.26
Massachusetts	82.05
New Jersey	82.05
Pennsylvania	77.56
Connecticut	69.87
Ohio	66.67
Indiana	61.54
Michigan	55.77
Texas	53.85
Arizona	42.95
Wisconsin	39.74
Oregon	39.74
Minnesota	38.46
New Hampshire	35.26
Washington	35.26
Colorado	33.33
Maryland	31.41
Rhode Island	29.49
Missouri	28.85
North Carolina	25.00
Florida	23.72
Delaware	22.44
Nebraska	22.44
Kentucky	21.15
Kansas	19.87
Vermont	19.87
Tennessee	19.23
Virginia	18.59
Iowa	17.95
Maine	16.03
South Carolina	14.74
Oklahoma	12.82
West Virginia	12.18
Utah	10.90
Georgia	8.97
Alabama	8.33
Mississippi	7.69
Louisiana	7.05
Wyoming	7.05
New Mexico	7.05
Nevada	5.13
Arkansas	2.56
North Dakota	2.56
Idaho	2.56
South Dakota	1.92
Hawaii	1.28
Alaska	.64
Montana	-----

On a regional basis WEMA's figures show 52 percent of its firms place orders in the west north-central region, 58 percent in the west south-central region, 94 percent in the east-north-central region, 34 percent in the east south-central region, 56 percent in the south Atlantic region, 97 percent in the middle Atlantic region and 88 percent in the New England region.

Often overlooked in the maze of industry statistics is the real reason for the West's leadership in electronics—the technology capability that has been developed by western firms. Since 1957, total employment in electronics in the West has increased 75 percent—from

123,200 to 215,000. In this same 5-year period, the number of graduate engineers in electronics in the West has gone up 100 percent—from 17,000 to 34,000. Nearly one of every six employees in electronic manufacturing firms in the West today has at least one degree in engineering.

A recent survey of WEMA member companies has shown that western electronic companies invest from each sales dollar five times as much in research and development as the average manufacturing firm in the United States. Electronic manufacturers in the West reported that in 1961 they invested 8.5 percent of sales in research and development. This compares to only 1.7 percent for all U.S. manufacturing industries.

In summary, the West has been pacing electronic growth in the United States and will continue to do so because the companies in the Western States have built up a tremendous technological capability that is unequaled anywhere. By investing heavily in research and development—and by exercising sound technical management—they expect to increase their share of the steadily expanding U.S. electronic market.

Increased Compensation for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, although I am the most recently elected Member of the House of Representatives, and as such would certainly not presume to tell the membership what to do, I would like to take the liberty of making a recommendation on behalf of our postal employees.

There has been a bill introduced by the ranking member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—H.R. 9531—which would provide the postal workers with a well-deserved increase in compensation and a liberalization of the step and longevity increases. Because I feel that this legislation is highly desirable and long overdue, I am today introducing a companion bill and would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The question of increased compensation for the postal employees has been before the Congress on previous occasions and action has been taken to somewhat alleviate the situation. However, with the devaluation of the dollar and the continued spiral of living costs, further assistance and consideration must be given our Federal employees. During the past years the salaries of these employees have not kept pace with the increases granted those in private industry. Many workers have been forced to work at additional employment, and in many instances it has been necessary for

the wives to leave the home and seek work in order to supplement the family income in an effort to provide the bare essentials.

This group of employees has served the American public well and faithfully over the years and I earnestly believe that their hard work and diligent efforts should be rewarded. I therefore urge that this legislation be enacted as quickly as possible.

Television Transcript of February 28, 1962, "Today" Program on Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following television transcript of "Today," which appeared on February 28, 1962:

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Well, tomorrow is the day that President Kennedy is scheduled to send to Congress his message on conservation. Now almost everybody in this country is willing to go on record in favor of conservation, but there is a division of opinion as to just what should be done about it. Beginning with Theodore Roosevelt the conservationists have put up a thin but vociferous line of champions who have given battle to preserve our natural resources. They have deplored the destruction of land, timber, minerals, water resources, and wildlife. They have not been shy in accusing business interests of exploiting the land without giving a thought to the future.

Private enterprise has countered these arguments by claiming that the conservationists are stirring the ashes of old crimes. They say that modern miners, ranchers, lumbermen, and other businessmen recognize conservation as something which is in their own interest. They say they can best practice conservation with a minimum of Government direction. Some claim that conservation is the smokescreen which conceals another Federal grab for power. But above this rather ancient quarrel there looms a relatively new danger—that is, the threat that our wilderness will be smothered by those who love it most. An expanding population with increased leisure time is being attracted more and more to outdoor recreation, and thus we now face the problem of how to re-create ourselves without laying waste to the countryside.

Well, beginning with this half hour on "Today," we are going to present a series of studies on the subject of conservation. We hope to present all sides of the question, and that's kind of a big order. It embraces a lot of territory, but we will do our best to be objective about this issue because we realize it is sensitive to a number of people. Today we will begin with an examination of the various conservation measures which are before Congress, or which are in the offing.

Our guest will be Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, the Democratic Senator from New Mexico, and we'll be talking with him in just a few moments.

Washington will be next, where Martin Agronsky is sitting with Senator CLINTON ANDERSON.

Senator ANDERSON is a prime mover in conservation legislation, a cosponsor of the wilderness bill which is now before the House. He is chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He is also a member of the commission which prepared a report for the President and the Congress—the report on outdoor recreation for America. With such credentials, Senator ANDERSON, we feel you are well equipped to be our first guest, and we're very happy to have you and Martin Agronsky, that noted walker who is standing there with you. Good morning, gentlemen. Martin, would you like to begin?

Mr. AGRONSKY. One more credential, by the way, for Senator ANDERSON—former Secretary of Agriculture in Mr. Truman's Cabinet?

Mr. CHANCELLOR. That's right.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator, can you tell us what the President is going to recommend in his message on conservation? I know you have been talking to him about this.

Senator ANDERSON. I think he'll do his own announcing, but I would be greatly surprised if he doesn't deal with the question of water pollution, and air pollution; if he doesn't deal with some of the recommendations in the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission's report. I would be surprised if he doesn't suggest some things about maybe a Federal Conservation Corps, similar to the old Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Oh, really?

Senator ANDERSON. I would also be surprised if he doesn't deal with seashore saving a little bit, because I know that's dear to his heart. He's lived along the coast enough so that he's very interested. And what we do to preserve the amount of seashore that now is available and still can be obtained for the public—in fact I think the President's message on conservation is going to take place along with Theodore Roosevelt's great message a long time ago. He is, in my opinion, going to be a great leader in that field, and I believe his message will be a very, very strong one.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, leaders need followers. What is Congress going to do about his recommendation?

Senator ANDERSON. I'm going to be one of the followers, and speak to others. But we have already done more I think than many Congresses have done. We have helped establish the Cape Cod seashore area; we're working on other areas like Point Reyes in California; we had a hearing yesterday on Padre Island, and reported that bill out, or will today—and so it goes. We're trying our very best to make sure that things like the wilderness bill pass. The President gave us tremendous help on the wilderness bill, and I believe he delighted the hearts of all those who are tremendously interested in this great subject of trying to make sure that we don't lose all the things that tell us what this continent was like when the white man first settled it.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator, I do want to hear from you something that interested me—this Conservation Corps—what is that?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, it's Senator HUMPHREY's idea. He has suggested that the Civilian Conservation Corps did fine work, back in the depression, and as a man who was one of Harry Hopkins' relief administrators, I agree with him. I think—the boys went into the areas and created parks, and trailways, and roads—there's a great deal of unemployment among the young now. I don't know what the President's going to say, but I would be surprised if he doesn't give Senator HUMPHREY's bill a little pat on the back, because this offers some possibilities for doing the work that we want done at very low cost, because it will be really work for young men who do not find other opportunities for employment.

Mr. AGRONSKY. John?

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Well, the wilderness bill has passed the Senate. Is that correct, sir?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes, it has, and gone to the House.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. And from your vantage point, there on the Hill, I know Senators don't often like to comment officially on what's going to happen in the House, but what do you think?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, we have a great ally in the House in JOHN SAYLOR, Republican, of Pennsylvania—I say that to show that this is bipartisan. I talked to JOHN a short time ago, and he said that he hoped it would pass the House—he believed it would. The chairman of the committee, the House Interior Committee, Congressman ASPINALL, is also a very fine man and a very loyal supporter of the wilderness idea. GRACE FROST is another, and I think with these fine leaders we can expect favorable action in the House. It's a little harder there, because you have the Rules Committee to worry with and other things of that nature, but I think that prospects are extremely good for its passage.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Well, Senator, one of the groups that is opposing the wilderness bill is the National Lumber Manufacturing Association. We've had word from them that 65 million acres of Federal land will be denied future development and general recreational use, if the wilderness bill goes through. What do you say about that?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I only wish they'd take a look at the wilderness areas and decide how much timber is on them. At the present time we're not cutting all the timber we could cut. And the use of lumber is going down a little bit—aluminum siding comes in—various other things are developed. But beyond that the timberlands that we have could be better utilized, there's not too much commercial timber in these wilderness areas. There may be some in the primitive areas—there's a difference between them. In the early thirties, the Secretary of Agriculture set up primitive areas, which were neither fish nor fowl; they didn't declare them to be wilderness, but they took them out of the ordinary forest, and these areas are going to be reappraised under the wilderness bill—many of them I think will be put back into ordinary forests, and I think the lumbermen should be interested in that. But beyond that I have ridden horseback over some of these wilderness areas, and I think that the opportunities for keeping them as they are are far more favorable to the general cause of conservation than opening them up for exploitation. The Gila wilderness in my State, the very first one, and the largest one, is a sample of a fine tract of land that's useful for people to study how things were originally. But nobody in his right mind would cut very much timber from it.

I just hope the lumber people are wrong, and I believe they are.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Well, if I could pursue this, sir, why do you think they've taken this attitude about the bill?

Senator ANDERSON. For the same reason that the oil people are worried about it. They hate to see anything put out of the possibility they could reach out and take it if they want it. The oil people are worried about the area, and I said to a very prominent oil man: "Suppose you come in and offer us a dollar an acre, as you do for any rough land, and we'll give you the whole wilderness area and let you explore it—it will be so many million dollars a year." He said, "I wouldn't want it"—but he wants it left open so he could take it, and I just think that he worries too much about it.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Sir, are there any cities under the wilderness bill that would have unemployment problems if you were to take over and make wildernesses out of areas that are now being commercially utilized near those towns?

Senator ANDERSON. We're not proposing that these areas that are involved in the wilderness bill are areas that already are either in wilderness or in primitive status as far as the Forest Service is concerned, or they're parts of national parks under Federal domain. Nobody in the city would be worried about the passage of this bill. But on the contrary people in the cities would have a chance to get out into the open country and show their children something about what this country was like originally. I think that's of great value to the country.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator, I had yesterday from your colleague, PAUL DOUGLAS, both a telephone call and a very full envelope on the Indiana Sand Dunes bill. We're going to move from the forest to the seashore for a moment. What about our seashores—what's happening there—is it covered to any extent in the bill?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, yes, there is a special bill on the acquisition of seashores, which has passed the Senate and gone to the House, and I was very happy to sponsor it. We suggest that the Government should put up about \$25 million a year to match the money that the States might put up, and counties might put up, municipalities, in order to acquire seashore areas. Had we done this 20 years ago, we could have acquired all we wanted for a few million dollars. Now the price is going up very, very rapidly, and that's what PAUL DOUGLAS is worried about, about the dunes—he wants to save them now, while it's financially possible. I agree with him, it ought to be done. We ought not to chop away the industrial chances of Indiana, but we ought to take these remaining stretches of land and try to preserve them. If we do it now, the people of Chicago, for example, and the people of northern Indiana will have a perfectly wonderful recreational area. Most of the national parks are where the people aren't. They're out in my State, they're in Colorado, they're around various other areas, and the population is limited in those areas. We need to be able to attract people from all over the country.

Now the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission found that people going out for recreation don't want to go too far from home. They enjoy walking, they enjoy bicycle riding, they enjoy canoeing, but they don't want to go too far, and if the people in Chicago could have this great weekend opportunity in the Indiana Dunes, I think they would enjoy it, and I think that as the population builds up in the cities, because you're building up in the cities very rapidly, we need to have places where future generations can go. You don't want to get to the point where you have to have priority in order to get to the Yellowstone National Park, and you're almost there now. If you want to go to Yellowstone Park in your automobile, you'd better be real sure you're not going on a day when somebody else has planned to go there. That's too bad. We ought to develop these areas, and I believe the Park Service will. But we ought also to have areas close to the great cities.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Standing room only in the wilderness.

Senator ANDERSON. Well, it isn't that bad, but it's pretty rough to try to find a spot when you go to Yellowstone now because there are so many cars, and so few trails. I'd advocate opening up more areas of Yellowstone—I believe that will be done. But along with it, you need to provide for the average person close to home a spot for recreation. That's what we're trying to do with Indiana, that's what we tried to do with Cape Cod—we had all the problems you could imagine in Cape Cod, and a very prominent Massachusetts young Senator tried to get a bill through, and he didn't succeed. But when he got to living on Pennsylvania Avenue, we all pitched in and tried to save the area that he and Senator Saltonstall had worked to save. And it's a fine thing for those people, and will be. There are other areas, like the Point Reyes area in California, that's going to be a very remarkably fine establishment, and those people with all the recreational opportunities that California has, can still stand just a little bit of seashore for the commonfolk. The rich have no trouble finding a place to go.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Senator, you have sponsored a bill in Congress involving water resources. Does that tie in with the overall wilderness bill in any way?

Senator ANDERSON. No. That's more to take care of the general situation that arises when we try to tell you what's going to happen to water. We're going to be awfully short of water, in cities and elsewhere in a short time—even in great areas like Los Angeles they have problems of water supply, and more and more our cities are going to be deficit areas as far as water is concerned. We have to find something we can do, and the water resources bill says let's pool all the engineering knowledge we have and try to find out what we can do to save the cities from facing a great water shortage in years to come. I think it's a fine bill.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Martin, one of the things I'm sure we'd both like to talk about is this whole business of a Federal takeover that has been charged against this kind of legislation. Would you care to frame a short question on that?

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, I think it's framed, really—do you feel, as many of the critics of the conservation bill contend, that it is really a way of the Federal Government moving in and taking over what really private industry should develop?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not at all. Not at all. The average State can't afford to do it for itself. For instance, why should New Mexico provide a park—we've got all the parks we want for ourselves. It becomes a national problem, and therefore the Nation has to take charge of trying to find these places, without regard to State lines.

Mr. AGRONSKY. John.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. I just want to say thank you, Senator, for spending this time with us this morning, and all good luck to you in your work, and every time we go for a walk in the wilderness we'll begin thinking of you—not that we hadn't thought of you before. And Martin, thanks to you. I went walking with Agronsky last weekend in Washington in Rock Creek Park, which is a great example of a park, in a great American city. I think that just about brings us to the conclusion of this hour.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable J. J. HICKEY, a Senator from the State of Wyoming.

Rev. Elmore Brown, minister, St. John's Methodist Church, Staunton, Va., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Eternal God, and whose purposes are not disturbed by the accidents of time, we appear before Thee this day in full assurance that this universe is in Thy control.

Across the many centuries Thou hast called men to be cosharers with Thee and with one another in the task of perfecting Thy creation.

We most humbly thank Thee for the place Thou hast permitted us to take in the affairs of the world as we have sought to make our great Nation a symbol of righteousness, of good will, and of peace.

We earnestly pray for Thy divine blessing to be upon those within these Halls who are called to render mighty decisions calculated to affect the destiny of millions of Thy children at home and

throughout the world. Imbue them with wisdom, and give to them sound insights and understandings, so that their judgments, like Thine own, may be true and righteous altogether.

Guide Thou our footsteps, that we may ever walk in Thy holy ways; and in so doing, may we fulfill the stewardship of responsibility and service we have pledged to Thee.

Hear this, our prayer, Most Holy Lord God, for to Thee we ascribe all majesty, dominion, and power, forever and ever. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. J. J. HICKEY, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HICKEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 5, 1962, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 5, 1962, the following reports of a committee was submitted on March 6, 1962:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 4. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore (Rept. No. 1226); and

S.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument (Rept. No. 1227).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.